DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 583 SO 024 750

AUTHOR VanSledright, Bruce A.
TITLE Knowledge Growth and Attitude Change in Fifth-Grade Students Who Studied the American Revolution.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 69p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Nashville, TN, November 19, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; Grade 5; Instructional Effectiveness; Intermediate Grades; Personality Studies; *Revolutionary War (United States); Socialization; *Social Studies; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Influence; Teaching Methods; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

This study explored the teaching practices and attitudes toward history of two fifth-grade teachers who taught their students about the American Revolution in 6-week units. Using case study, interviewing, observations, and student attitudes assessments, the study examined how the fifth graders reconstructed elements of the American Revolution period. Differences in the teachers' practices are examined briefly to establish a context for the teaching-learning environment. The findings suggest that what and how much the students learned about content of the units appeared similar, despite differences in how the teachers mediated the units. One group did develop a greater appreciation for point of view in history, for the importance of using history as a tool to address present problems, and for the value of democratic attitudes and actions. The study suggests there are implications for those policymakers who must make curricular and content decisions in schools. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 583

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

KNOWLEDGE GROWTH AND ATTITUDE CHANGE IN FIFTH-GRADE STUDENTS WHO STUDIED THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
BRUCE A. VANSLEDRIGHT
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Bruce A. VanSledright
University of Maryland, College Park

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies
19 November 1993

SO 024 750

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Knowledge Growth and Attitude Change in Two Classes
of Fifth Graders Who Studied the American Revolution Period

Abstract

Motivated in part by the need to assess the viability of current constructivist learning theories to the domain of history education, those who have reviewed the literature have called for detailed studies that examine student learning in the context of teaching. Using naturalistic, case study methodology, this study explored the curriculum "mediation" or "gatekeeping" practices (Parker, 1987; Thornton, 1991 respectively) of two fifth-grade teachers who taught their students about the American Revolution in six-week units. Employing a variety of measures, the study in turn examined how the fifth graders reconstructed elements of the American Revolution period. First, this report briefly examines differences in the teachers' practices to provide teaching-learning contexts. It then turns to student learning. The findings suggest that, despite differences in the way in which the teachers mediated the unit, what and how much the students learned about the content of the units appeared similar. However, following the differential influence of the teachers, one group of students developed a greater appreciation for point of view in history, for the importance of using history as a tool to address present problems, and for the value of democratic attitudes and actions. First, the findings are discussed in relationship to the teaching-learning dilemmas, trade-offs, and curriculum policy issues arising from the teachers' practices and student learning. Following from this discussion, implications of the findings are assessed with regard to the viability of current constructivist theories and research for teaching and learning U.S. history.

Knowledge Growth and Attitude Change in Two Classes
of Fifth Graders Who Studied the American Revolution Period

Those who have reviewed the research literature have noted that more studies are needed to expand our knowledge of contextual circumstances in which social education curricula are taught and learned (Armento, 1986; Brophy, 1990; Marker & Mehlinger, 1992). This, reviewers further point out, is particularly true with regard to elementary education (Brophy, 1990) and in the subject matter area of history (Downey & Levstik, 1991).

In the opening line to their chapter in the current *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (Shaver, 1991), Downey and Levstik (1991) state, "The research base for the teaching and learning of history is thin and uneven" (p.400). They follow this with:

> Much of the professional literature about history teaching consists either of descriptions of exemplary practices, usually reports from the teachers who developed the approach or method, or untried prescriptions for effective teaching. The claims for the exemplary nature of the methods being recommended are seldom supported by evidence of what or how much student learning took place. There is a dearth of research studies on history teaching in large part because little of the research on teaching and learning within the social studies has been discipline-centered. Consequently, most of the systematic research that has been done in history education is of relatively recent origin. A number of areas of critical importance to the field still remain largely unexplored. (p. 400)

To substantiate this last claim, Downey and Levstik (1988) had earlier indicated those unexplored areas of importance. Talking about history education in general, and U.S. history in particular, they argued,

> We know little about how interaction among students, teachers, and others whose influence is felt in the classroom affects how history is taught and learned. We...need more research on how teachers introduce concepts of historical time, and whether current practice contributes to rather than eases the difficulties children have in these areas. We need to develop and test empirically curricula based on new understandings of human cognition that have emerged in recent years. (p. 341)

Brophy (1990), in his summary of social education research, noted that,

> Not much research has been done in social studies classes, and most of the available findings are focused on relatively narrow issues (the effects of questioning students at primarily lower v. primarily higher cognitive levels, the effects of advance organizers on learning from lectures, etc.). The paucity of research is especially noticeable at the elementary level. (p.396)

These assessments of the literature and their calls for additional research are motivated, in part, by the desire to apply current theory and research on subject-matter teaching to history education. These theories emphasize, among other things, the importance of teaching school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and life application, not just content memorization and skills practice (Brophy, 1990; Newmann, 1990; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989). Drawing on neo-Vygotskian theorizing and work on knowledge construction, conceptual change, and situated learning, educators have been developing methods of teaching school subjects in ways that connect with students' existing knowledge and experience and engage them in actively constructing new knowledge. Growth in this work has been most evident in the subject areas of mathematics and science, where literatures have accumulated describing what children typically know about the content taught at their respective grade levels (for example, see Volume 93, 1992, of *The Elementary School Journal*).

Applying similar ideas to teaching, learning, and curriculum development in history appears to be warranted (Levstik & Pappas, 1992). However, realizing the potential of these approaches will fall short unless research first describes children's knowledge growth and change in the history content commonly taught at each grade level. Such research would assist educators and curriculum developers in determining if these ideas were indeed applicable to history education and, if so, in what ways. Most such studies have only recently begun.

Researchers interested in child development have conducted a few studies on stage growth and change in areas of economic, social, and political knowledge (Berti & Bombi, 1988; Furnham & Stacy, 1991; Furth, 1980; Moore, Lare, & Wagner, 1985). Others have conducted survey-type research. Guzetta (1969) and Ravitch and Finn (1987), for example, surveyed students' recall of discrete facts such as names, places, and definitions of key cultural literacy-type items but limited

their reporting to percentages of students who recalled items correctly. These studies generally were silent on the relationship between teaching and learning.

In Great Britain, Dickinson and Lee (1984) and Shemilt (1984) reported on levels of young adolescent historical understanding and empathy. In the U.S., Levstik and Pappas (1987) concentrated on children's historical understandings by asking them to recall a historical narrative and then to define history and distinguish it from "the past." McKeown and Beck (1990) described fifth- and sixth-graders' changing knowledge concerning a curriculum unit on the American Revolution. Ramsey, Holbrook, Johnson, and O'Toole (1992) studied four-year-olds' beliefs about Native Americans after a curriculum unit designed to confront specific stereotypes. Brophy, VanSledright, and Bredin (1992, 1993) and VanSledright and Brophy (1992) examined fifth-graders ideas about and reconstructions of U.S. history before and after an initial unit on the subject. These studies appear valuable for enhancing our understanding about children's growing and changing knowledge. However, many more are needed if we are to understand how to develop and test these newer educational theories in the curricular area of history and in the context teachers create for learning.

The research reported here attempts to build upon and add to these earlier studies. It uses empirical data (a) to consider the teaching-learning relationship in elementary school history education, (b) the implied curriculum trade-offs and policy issues that an examination of two teachers' practices raise, and (c) how these issues may (or may not) connect to applications of current theory. Curriculum theory and policy issues and their attendant debates often turn on normative questions. Yet, empirical findings can be serve as grist for those debates by exploring potential implications of the issues involved. Thus, research can deepen our understanding of those issues.

The study explored the ways in which two fifth-grade teachers "mediated" or "gatekept"[1] the U.S. history curriculum and what factors influenced their interpretations and decisions. Data were collected about how the teachers' decisions in turn influenced the ways their students constructed an understanding of the American Revolution period they studied. In this report, the

data on student learning receives a greater share of the attention. However, in order to situate this learning, a brief description and analysis of each teacher's pedagogical approach is provided.[2] These teaching-learning contexts often were absent from previous studies, limiting our understanding of learning as influenced by teaching.

Data Collection

Naturalistic, case study methods were employed. Initially, five elementary school teachers were interviewed. These interviews were used to assist in the selection of informants. The purpose was to determine if and then how teachers varied in their mediation/gatekeeping practices. Criteria for selection were borrowed from the literature (e.g., the "three traditions" of Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977; the five history teacher "typologies" of Evans, 1989; the "five approaches" suggested by Martorella, 1985). Evan's typologies helped differentiate the teachers' self-reported practices most succinctly. Therefore, they are used here. These categories seem well suited to the teaching of history because they derive specifically from a study of a fairly large sample of history teachers (n=71).

Evans (1989) studied this group of history teachers in secondary schools in Maine. He was searching for metaphors to describe how these teachers thought about the teaching and learning of history. After surveying and then interviewing these teachers about their beliefs, philosophies, and teaching practices, Evans constructed the following five typologies to describe the teachers: (a) the *storyteller,* who demonstrated an idealist philosophy of history in stories he/she would construct and tell about the importance of "our" past; (b) the *scientific historian*, who held a view of historical knowledge wherein history was considered scientific if it focused on rigorous research methods and produced evidence-based generalizations from and about the historical record; (c) the *relativist-reformer*, who possessed a philosophy of historical relativism and was interested in using the lessons of history--a record of past mistakes or failures--to reform the present; (d) the *cosmic-philosopher*, who viewed history as a metanarrative for the human race; and (e) the *eclectic*, respondents in the sample who showed no central tendency toward any one

approach. Of the two teachers selected for study, Ramona Palmer (all identifying names are pseudonyms) best fits the scientific historian type and Sara Atkinson, the relativist-reformer type.[3]

Both teachers taught in the same school district, educated similar student populations (middle- to upper-middle socioeconomic class backgrounds), and utilized the same intended district history curriculum. Both came highly recommended by peers and supervisory colleagues, had attained master's degrees (Palmer in social studies, Atkinson in elementary education), were veteran teachers (25 years each), and were interested in and committed to high quality history education for their students.

The teachers were interviewed extensively. They were asked to discuss relevant aspects of their autobiographies, describe their views on teaching and learning, identify their goals for fifth-grade U.S. history, discuss content selection and representation, classroom discourse, activities and assignments, assessment practices, and their views on teaching for understanding, critical thinking, and decision making. As the units progressed, both teachers also were interviewed informally.

The American Revolution period served as the principal subject content. This period was selected for several reasons. First, for students it typically details the formal instantiation of the "democratic tradition" in this country. As such, it can possess important implications for citizenship education (espoused as a "central mission" in social education) and thereby can warrant careful study (McKeown & Beck, 1990; Thornton & McCourt-Lewis, 1990). Second, it involved subject matter that both teachers taught in depth (6 weeks), and so was amenable to detailed exploration. And third, it represented a historical period with multiple points of view (British, French, loyalist, revolutionist) and conflicting interpretations (economic, political) that some historians have found compelling (see Bailyn, 1967; Beard, 1913/1935; Beloff, 1949/1963; Greene, 1968; Morgan, 1956). Consequently, it shed light on the interpretive differences influencing the teachers' curriculum gatekeeping practices and student learning.

To obtain information about what students learned as a result of their experience with the unit, several data collection methods were used. Prior to teaching the unit, both teachers were

asked to select a stratified sample of six students (by achievement and gender: three males and three females, two higher achievers, two middle-level achievers, and two lower achievers; one of each sex at each stratum) to be interviewed using a structured interview protocol (Appendices A and B). The protocols consisted of two sections: One that explored the knowledge students could reconstruct about the period, and the other assessed changes in students' dispositions toward democratic ideas and actions. The latter sought to explore the possibility that, in learning about the spirit of democracy which (partly) fueled colonial rebelliousness and embodied itself in the Constitution and Bill of Rights, students' appreciation of and propensity to act on this new knowledge would change. A K-W-L questionnaire (Ogle, 1986) also was administered before and after the unit to all students in each class. These two procedures were augmented by daily informal conversations with students and student assignment samples. Once the teachers began teaching, fieldnotes were compiled for each class session and documents the teachers used were collected. Each lesson was audiotaped and portions of these tapes were transcribed for analysis. Atkinson taught 22, 55-minute lessons (approximately 1210 minutes) and Palmer taught 26, 45-minute lessons (approximately 1170 minutes).

Analysis Procedures

Teacher Interviews

From transcribed teacher interviews, summary descriptions were written about each teacher. Efforts were made to note themes and counter-themes in what the teachers said about their goals, curriculum mediation practices, and teaching lives. The summary descriptions were used against the backdrop of fieldnotes and in relationship to the documents the teachers used. The purpose involved triangulating the data and addressing further forms of evidence that supported or disconfirmed teachers' self-portrayals and the themes and counter-themes generated about those self-portrayals (Glaser & Strauss, 1975; Goetz & LeCompte, 1981).

Documents

Documents collected included district curriculum guidelines, teacher-made classroom advance organizers, activities and assignments, texts and descriptions of audiovisual materials, and

other such items that pertained to the unit. Document analysis allowed checks on interpretive categories evolving from teacher and student interviews and observation data.

Student Assignment Samples

Assignment samples were analyzed to inform interpretations of student knowledge constructions and learning processes. The assignment samples also were analyzed relative to the goals the teachers expressed for an activity or assignment. These activities and goals varied with gatekeeping practices. Only one assignment sample permitted cross-case analysis and comparison. Both teachers administered the same publisher-supplied test (on the Silver Burdett & Ginn textbook, Chapter 7; Helmus, Toppin, Pounds, & Arndorf, 1988) near the end of the units. Mean scores for the test's 35 multiple-choice items were computed for each class and compared.

K-W-L Forms

The first two sections of the K-W-L instrument ("What do I know about the American Revolution?" and "What do I want to know?") were administered by each teacher to their entire class approximately a week prior to beginning the American Revolution unit. A week after the unit, the final section ("What have I learned about the period?") was completed. The K-W-Ls augmented structured and informal student interview data by broadening the sample size. Here they are used primarily as a method for examining how general student ideas about unit content changed.

The data generated by the K-W-L forms were analyzed without a priori coding schemes. Initially, all student responses were paraphrased. In paraphrasing, care was taken to retain as many of the students' actual words as possible. Once all the paraphrased responses were listed, searching began for other responses similar in language use and apparent meaning. Judgments about the similarities of responses used language similarity as the primary criterion. Generally, if a student's language use differed from other students, although the meaning was judged to be similar, the response was nevertheless listed separately. The purpose was to preserve noteworthy qualitative differences. Category headings (e.g., Names, Events, Terms) employed in Tables 1 and 3 were developed post facto to aid data comparisons.

Student Interview Data

The student interviews were used to augment K-W-L and student assignment data and provide more in-depth, qualitative information about what a subsample of students were learning. Both pre- and postunit interviews for the 6 students from each class were audiotaped and transcribed. Transcripts were edited to remove identifying names and to enhance word and punctuation clarity, although the latter changes were kept to a minimum. The ensuing analysis procedure remained similar to the K-W-Ls. Extensive lists of student responses emerged once the data were organized. To further organize and reduce this large amount of interview data, tables were constructed to display modal responses for questions paired in pre/post categories. Salient sample quotations from the students were identified and appear in the findings section.

Comparative Synthesis of the Teacher Case Studies

We turn first to an introduction of the teachers, their teaching approaches, and the contexts they created. Then, to highlight their differences, they are compared briefly using criteria advanced by Reed (1989) and Newman (1990). These comparisons are followed by a more expansive look at the student learning data.

Ramona Palmer

Palmer taught at Matewan Elementary School, a comprehensive K-5 school with 400 students. The school was located in a medium-sized city in the northern Midwest. The student body was approximately 90% White, 6% were African American, and 4% were Asian American. There were 28 students in Palmer's class. Three were African Americans (11%) and three were Asian Americans (11%). The school district curriculum called for survey treatment of the American Revolution period.

Palmer grew up in a moderately large midwestern city. She attended Catholic grade schools and a challenging liberal arts Catholic college. At one point, she had prepared to become a nun. While in preparation, she was asked to teach in Catholic elementary schools. There she fell in love with teaching. Choosing to abandon religious preparation, she finished her undergraduate education and began teaching in the public schools. With the exception of short breaks around the

time her two children were born (now early adolescents), she had taught elementary school consecutively, most of those years at the upper grades. Palmer was generally business-like and formal. But she did possess a subtle, witty, and upbeat sense of humor that her students appeared to enjoy.

Palmer's interest in American history stemmed in part from experiences in the classes of several inspirational college historians. She recalled these professors fondly and distinctly. As she described them and the influences they had on her burgeoning interest in history, it became clear that these historians shared much in common with the "scientific historian" school (Evans, 1989). The way Palmer approached the subject matter of history appeared to have some of its origin in her educational experiences with these historians. To be sure, other factors played a role. However, observing Palmer teach and exploring the way she mediated the history curriculum reflected these experiences particularly.

In teaching the unit, Palmer employed a variety of pedagogical strategies: games, audiovisual experiences, a simulation exercise, projects and presentations, writing, and discussion. These were designed to move her fifth graders systematically toward the goals she had set: (a) making history "come alive," that is, making it "internally exciting" by connecting it to children's lives, (b) emphasizing the importance of developing evidence and understanding causal relationships, (c) fostering empathy and imagination through historical fiction accounts and (d) building initial ideas about and appreciation for the sequence of events, details, and the personalities of the American Revolution. Here is an abbreviated account of how she taught the unit.

Palmer began the unit by situating the Revolution on a time line. To immerse her students into the context and details of the period, she showed several filmstrips about colonial life on the eve of the Revolution. Sensing that her students lacked an understanding of the "causal" connections between the French and Indian War, taxation issues, and the Revolution, she spent several class periods considering these details. She then quizzed her students on those details, played a review activity she called "Historical Jeopardy" (content drawn from the textbook), and

conducted a simulation exercise designed to recreate colonial frustrations with the "tax burden." Students then were asked to write a letter to an imaginary relative in England explaining recent colonial developments. They were also placed in cooperative groups to read and report on a set of tradebooks and alternative texts (historical fiction). Palmer hoped to provide a number of different accounts to focus partly on point of view, but also to provide a more detailed picture of the revolutionary era. The constitutional convention process and the new government emerging from it were considered briefly. This brevity appeared necessary to allow room for a multiple-lesson exploration of the Bill of Rights and its implications. The discussions that ensued were powerful and engaging for students (see [author], 1992b for a detailed account). Through this focus on the Bill of Rights, Palmer wished to teach her students that history "still lives today" (see her goal noted above). The unit ended here with a test.

Palmer arranged for in-depth treatment of the period and built it around key ideas and clear goals. Her case offers an example of fifth-grade U.S. history teaching focused on the importance of developing historical knowledge with a scientific historian's slant. Students left the unit with a considerably enhanced appreciation for the historical period called the American Revolution. In general, they recalled many details and indicated some initial understanding of causal relationships. A number of students stated considerable interest in the period. General involvement in the lessons suggested that students as a whole found much of the material stimulating and memorable.

Sara Atkinson

Atkinson was a sprightly, effervescent, and talkative elementary school veteran. She taught fifth grade at Greenwood Elementary, which is a predominantly White (92%), middle- to upper-middle-class school of 250 students in the same medium-sized district and metropolitan area in which Palmer taught. Born and raised in one of the northern mid-Atlantic states, she pursued a postsecondary education in the Midwest, receiving bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees from a Michigan university. As an undergraduate, she completed a language arts major and science and social science dual minors. She had taught sixth grade until the advent of middle schools at which point she transferred to fifth grade. There were 26 students in Atkinson's class. Twenty-two were

White, 2 were African-American, and 2 were Hispanic. One student was a mainstreamed girl with cerebral palsy who required considerable individual attention from Atkinson.

Atkinson's own childhood had a significant impact on her attitudes toward U.S. history. The power of her own New England-like oral tradition imbued in her a sense of the past that she strove to communicate to her students. Her sense of this oral tradition was coupled with the belief that, at its center, the concept of democracy--citizen rights and responsibilities--flourished. For her, this oral tradition was democracy: the right to argue, negotiate, participate, and decide. This process, she said, was practiced in her family as far back as she could remember. The process usually focused on social issues and problems and how to "fix them," thus laying a framework for her reformist perspective (Evans, 1989). This democratic, reformist framework became the historical, curricular thread with which she tried to weave the classroom context.

Atkinson's goals turned on constructing a classroom in an ethos of participatory democracy. That ethos was nurtured in a context where individual rights and personal responsibilities were often at issue, discussion of issues proliferated, knowledge claims were understood as tools giving substance to learning, and reflective decision making and informed action were desired dispositions. In attending to that ethos, Atkinson took as many opportunities as she could find to interject implications of current social issues into the study of the Revolution period (e.g., women's "nonparticipation" in the Constitutional Convention, the governing "mistakes" of the Articles of Confederation, contemporary justice concerns relating to past slavery practices). She would exhort her students to think about these issues and find ways to act on decisions to "fix" them. Often, consideration of "solutions" appeared in the way the classroom operated organizationally. Students frequently were asked to participate in making decisions about the future course of class actions. Some student interview data reflected Atkinson's ability to communicate these goals and processes. Here is an abbreviated account of how she taught the unit (see [author] 1992c for a detailed treatment).

Atkinson began the unit by asking her students to question and criticize the colonists' use of propaganda in terms such as the Boston Tea Party, the Boston Massacre, and the Intolerable

Acts. Here, she attempted to set the stage for the conflicting viewpoints driving the impending war. Like Palmer, Atkinson used the textbook and a series of filmstrips near the beginning of the unit to deepen students' background knowledge. Atkinson would typically show a filmstrip, then discuss its content with the class. She did this by asking students to provide their views of what they had seen or read. She would sometimes challenge their ideas, ask for evidence, and encourage students to challenge her in the same way. Near the middle of the unit, Atkinson contracted walking pneumonia and was absent for 4 consecutive days. A substitute taught the history but in didactic fashion at odds with Atkinson's style. Students appeared discontented.

After Atkinson returned, she felt "behind" and "rushed to reteach and catch up." Instead of engaging her students in a structured debate on colonial and British viewpoints concerning the conflict as she intended, she held a shortened discussion of the issues viewed from both angles. Then, as review for the upcoming test, the class played a version of "Historical Jeopardy" (similar in content to Palmer's yet different in rule structures, much of which were developed by the students). Atkinson administered the same test Palmer used. She followed this with a mini-unit on the construction, debate, and ratification of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. She used the Bill of Rights to invoke discussion about how the U.S. system was repeatedly amended to address social justice issues. Amid this discussion, she asked her students to evaluate the role women and people of color have played in American history. The mini-unit ended with a short quiz.

Atkinson tried to bring classroom life to a participatory definition of democracy (Barber, 1989; Gutmann, 1987), a definition filled with her focus on using history to think about reforming society's ills. Bringing this definition into her classroom, along with spending the time-consuming activities that it required (e.g., questioning and arguing about issues), detracted comparatively little from what students learned about the events and details of the American Revolution period. Her students appeared to acquire as much knowledge about the period as Palmer's despite the teachers' different gatekeeping practices.[4]

Comparing Teaching Practices

To add depth to this comparison of the teachers' classroom activities and teaching practices, and make possible connections to student knowledge growth and attitude change, I employ two sets of analysis criteria. The first set derives from the work of Reed (1989). The criteria describe what she perceives to be a cluster of 10 outcomes that define "good history education" (see also Whelan, 1992, p. 7) The second comes from Newmann's (1990) work on what he terms "thoughtful social studies classrooms." These two sets of criteria were chosen because first, they are pragmatically useful for making sense of classroom environments. Second, they assume somewhat different perspectives on what is important to learning, yet overlap in ways that are consistent with constructivist theories of learning. And third, they appear germane to the subject-matter of U.S. history.[5] Figure 1 summarizes Reed's criteria.

Figure 1. Criteria for "Good History Teaching" (Reed, 1989)

Cultivating historical empathy
Developing an appreciation of cultural diversity and shared humanity
Engendering an understanding of the interplay of change and continuity in history
Establishing a grasp of the complexity of historical causation
Developing a respect for historical details
Creating a suspicion of abstract generalizations
Appreciating the importance of the personal character of individuals as they influence human affairs
Developing the ability to recognize the difference between fact and conjecture
Identifying the difference between evidence and assertion
Generating "useful" historical questions

Data from both classes suggested that the teachers encouraged their students to develop a degree of empathy for differing points of view as well as for the difficulties historical actors encountered during the American Revolution. Atkinson stressed empathy through her focus on point of view, reading for historical subtext (e.g., looking for colonial "propaganda," see Wineburg, 1991), and especially through the political machinations involved in ratifying the Constitution. Palmer encouraged empathy through the simulation exercise on colonial taxation, designed to affect "colonist resentment." The same was the case in the letters Palmer's students were asked to write to a relative in England.

Despite stipulating goals related to the importance of teaching about cultural diversity, neither teacher demonstrated much of this in the unit. This might be related to their perception that the unit's historical specificity (or at least what the textbook circumscribed) did not lend itself to a consideration of this issue. Atkinson did devote part of a lesson to a reading and discussion of the ethnic and ethical issues tied up in the story of a confrontation between a rabbi and young synagogue vandals. However, this appeared peripheral to the unit. Palmer took no similar routes.

Palmer and Atkinson also emphasized a sense of the interplay of causal factors relevant to this period. Palmer, in keeping with her "scientific" orientation, did more with this than Atkinson. However, the degree to which students understood the interplay of continuity and change in history is difficult to understand based on an analysis of only one unit. Respect for historical details and particularities and appreciation for the importance of the personal character of individuals who influence human affairs were evident in both classrooms. Palmer focused on personal character more frequently. Again, Palmer's emphasis on the relationship between details, historical actors, and causal connections was consistent with her scientific historian approach.

Both Atkinson and Palmer were concerned that their students develop at least some suspicion of abstract generalizations and recognize the difference between fact and conjecture and between evidence and assertion. In that first lesson (and at other points), Atkinson invoked suspicions and questions of evidence in connection with colonial propaganda (e.g., "Why would colonists call it a 'tea party'?"). Modeling a critical, questioning posture was consistent with her "reformist" spirit. Palmer, for example, tried to get her students to support their opinions with evidence in an "advantages/disadvantages" exercise on British taxation policy she conducted following the simulation. In the discussion of the Bill of Rights in Palmer's class, she made a point to request that her students support their assertions about the value of certain rights by using examples. Also, in interviews, students in both classes remarked about the importance of possessing at least some book-based evidence when assertions were put forth. Palmer appeared more concerned with the amount of evidence available to support claims. Atkinson focused on evidence as a source for developing a reformist critique.

Atkinson stressed the ability to frame useful questions more so than did Palmer. She frequently modeled the questioning process. She also encouraged her students to generate questions and requested that they be openly curious. Classroom observations bore out this difference: Atkinson's students were generally more gregarious and inquisitive; Palmer's were more reserved. This may be tied to differences in the way in which the teachers structured opportunities for asking questions. In turn, it likely is related to differences in their approaches to history and in the way they organized classroom discourse (Palmer, more controlling; Atkinson, more open).

Next, we apply Newmann's (1990) criteria. Newmann believes they identify hallmarks of strong social studies teaching which emphasizes higher-order thinking. A number of these criteria are consistent with the current theory and research on the teaching of knowledge for understanding and life-application purposes. As noted, several also overlap with Reed's list. Figure 2 summarizes Newmann's criteria.

Figure 2. "Thoughtful Social Studies Classrooms" Criteria (Newmann, 1990)

Discourse focuses in depth on a few topics rather than on a shallow overview of many
Classroom interaction reflects continuity and coherence of ideas
Students are encouraged to think before responding to questions
Teachers ask students to clarify and justify their responses and assertions
Teachers model thoughtfulness by articulating problem-solving processes and acknowledging the difficulties inherent in such processes
Student discourse focuses on the presence of novel ideas and understandings concerning the topics studied, rather than routine recall

---

Both Palmer and Atkinson focused students' attention around key issues and events in the unit. Both teachers tried to tell a coherent story about initial conflict, war, and triumph/defeat. These stories, for the most part, left out extraneous details and dealt with the issues in depth. Differences evident in student interview reconstructions appeared connected to the differences in what the teachers stressed. Again, more discussion of issues occurred in Atkinson's class than in Palmer's (in keeping with their differences). However, the intensity of the discussion in Palmer's room during the treatment of the Bill of Rights was seldom matched in Atkinson's. This may be connected to the way Palmer controlled and limited classroom discourse in lessons to that point.

Thus, Palmer had more time to spend in a lengthy discussion at the end of the unit. Atkinson was more open to student talk and spent more time in discussion throughout the unit. Her illness also caused changes. Following it, she began to push more quickly through the unit, sometimes truncating student-initiated discourse. Despite these differences, both teachers allowed students time to think before answering questions.

Much of the way Atkinson ran her classroom connects to Newmann's (1990) fourth criterion: the teacher asks students to clarify and justify their assertions. Classroom observations showed Atkinson asking students to support their points of view with "evidence" from previous lessons, the textbook, and their own thinking (without always asking them to distinguish between evidence and assertion specifically). In the post-unit interviews, several of Atkinson's students noted that, when arguments over issues occurred, one could use the teacher, historians, and textbook to "back up your opinion." Atkinson was asking her students to search for evidence to support a critique of "historical mistakes." Palmer also stressed a similar need for clarification and justification. However, her approach, the emphasis she placed on details, and the way she designed lessons gave students fewer discursive opportunities to provide them.

Both teachers modeled the problem-solving process and showed interest in students' ideas and suggestions. However, Atkinson again demonstrated a more sustained approach here. Both also indicated that problem solving and decision making were difficult, uncertain practices. Palmer, attempting to avoid positioning herself on the capital punishment issue raised during the discussion of the "cruel and unusual punishment" amendment, probably signaled to students how difficult certain choices were. However, another way to read this involves noting that Palmer's effort at "detachment" and "objectivity" in the face of a normative issue is consistent with a scientific historian approach (Evans, 1989). For her part, Atkinson tended to throw decisions into the air rather frequently. Her questioning style and reformist impulse may have suggested to students that few matters ought to be taken on authority or faith alone and that the source of "solutions" needed to be worked out by students themselves. The differences between the teachers involved a matter of degree and range of application: Palmer tended to be more controlling,

structured, and cautious; Atkinson more aggressive, contentious, and incisive. These characteristics were tied interactively to each teacher's overall history goals and gatekeeping practices.

If the unit lessons are taken as a whole, Atkinson, more so than Palmer, stressed that students produce more novel questions and ideas. It might be more reasonable to say that Atkinson's students tended to generate more unsolicited, novel ideas because Atkinson encouraged and sanctioned them. Palmer's students were also creative (e.g., their letters to English relatives), but usually within the parameters of specified assignments and learning activities. The lengthy discussion of the Bill of Rights was an exception.[6]

In summary, Atkinson's classroom appeared to be a more "thoughtful" environment than Palmer's based on Newmann's (1990) six attributes. Her students were challenged to think and discuss their thinking more often than were Palmer's students. Atkinson's reformist style generally emphasized using history to question and challenge claims and identify "mistakes in need of correction." Palmer's interest in details, amount of evidence for claims, causation, and the historical record per se reflected her more scientific historian orientation. Because Reed (1989) is primarily interested in disciplinary history (to which scientific historians have claimed allegiance), Palmer's mediation practices appear more consonant with her criteria. Such differences run to the heart of curriculum debates in history education. They point to the trade-offs that result when choosing certain goals and practices over others (see Evans, 1992; Whelan, 1992).[7] So how did these different approaches and gatekeeping practices influence students? We address this question next, beginning with the K-W-L data.

Comparisons of Student Learning

K-W-L Questionnaire

A comparative examination of the K-W-L forms indicates interesting differences, particularly on the L section but also to a lesser degree on the prior knowledge (K) and the questions (W) sections. In general, Palmer's students had more to say in most categories (e.g., Names, Events, Terms, etc.) on the K section than did Atkinson's (Table 1). They appeared to

have a slightly broader grasp of the period's people, events, terms, causal relationships, and general ideas. Six of Atkinson's students said they knew very little or nothing about the period to be studied, whereas, only one student from Palmer's class said the same. The notable differences between the student groups in the Names, Events, and Terms category occurred primarily with reference to Paul Revere, his famous ride, details about the battles during the war, and several terms that a few students in Palmer's class mentioned. The frequency of Palmer's students' reference to Paul Revere, his famous ride, and the early battles of the Revolution resulted from their exposure to this story in historical fiction form in fourth grade.

[insert Table 1 about here]

For causal relationships, differences were less clear. Several of Palmer's students logically deduced that Americans had won the war, but only a handful of students in each class had much knowledge of causal developments. Two students in each class believed that "the Americans" had started the war and one student in Palmer's class confused the American Revolution with the Civil War (see also McKeown & Beck, 1990). Two of Atkinson's students knew that the war was fought over freedom (at least from a U.S. perspective), but no one from Palmer's class mentioned this.

Palmer's students offered considerably more general ideas about the period than did Atkinson's. A bit surprisingly, one of Palmer's students knew about the Hessians hired by "the Brits," she said, to fight against the colonists. Another student in Palmer's class thought that the Revolution was fought between the French and the Americans, perhaps a reference to the French and Indian War. The most common responses in each class (Atkinson's: "It was a revolution; a war"; Palmer's: "Many people died") were responses that seemed to be deductions based on general familiarity with the term The American Revolution and an understanding that war frequently results in many casualties. In general, prior knowledge of the period appeared sketchy at best for both classes (see also McKeown and Beck, 1990).

Table 2 depicts virtually verbatim all of the questions asked by each group of students. Palmer's students asked more questions than did Atkinson's. Over half of Atkinson's students

were content to state that they wanted to know everything or anything and leave it at that. Only three of Palmer's students responded in the same fashion. On the whole, Palmer's students produced more specific questions and a wider range of them. "How and why they fought?" and "When it happened?" were favorites.

[insert Table 2 about here]

Taken on its face, Table 3 suggests that Palmer's students emerged from studying the revolutionary period with a greater general and specific recall of key terms, events, people, causal relationships and general ideas than did Atkinson's. Atkinson's then-recent emphasis on the *Constitution* and the struggle over its ratification became salient for her students. This salience appeared in the case of the importance of the Boston Tea Party (as a compelling causal incident) and the general role of women in the war as well. However, beyond these factors, her students did not appear to display an appreciable gain in their knowledge following the unit compared to Palmer's students. With the exception of references to the process of creating and ratifying the *Constitution* (Palmer did very little with this), Palmer's students showed significant gains in each category. Their knowledge of the period appeared broader, more connected, and more sensitive to historical details and their inter-relationships, which was consistent with Palmer's approach.

[insert Table 3 about here]

On the surface, the K-W-L forms indicate that Palmer's emphasis on an appreciation of the American Revolution period, on its actors, what they did, and with what results had an important influence on what her students were able to recall. She apparently achieved reasonable success in communicating these ideas to her students and thereby attaining her goals. Atkinson's students fared less well by contrast. One might conclude that Atkinson's reformist and democratic citizenship goals took too much valuable time away from the content and storyline of the revolutionary period. Her students, therefore, developed a more limited sense of that history. Comparatively, Palmer's students appeared to benefit more by the in-depth coverage of the period as evidenced by the details they reconstructed. This seems consistent with her efforts to stress the

quantity of evidence necessary for making assertions. However, it must be noted that the teachers interpreted the use of the K-W-L questionnaire differently.

Atkinson allowed about 10 minutes for her students to fill in the K-W-L, both before and after the unit. She had not used it before and saw it as designed primarily to serve research interests and not her own goals specifically. Palmer, by contrast, had used the questionnaire before in language arts, valued the information it generated, and asked her students to take about 45 minutes both before and after the unit to fill it out. As a result, drawing substantive conclusions based on the K-W-L data alone is problematic. Furthermore, the K-W-Ls fail to provide much insight into Atkinson's reformist orientation or the democratic citizenship dispositions that she stressed. To probe more deeply, we turn next to the student interview data.

Comparisons of Student Interview Responses

The six interviewees from Palmer's class were Barry and Abigail, the higher achievers; Adam and Lorrie, the middle-level achievers; and Frederic and Lara, the lower achievers. From Atkinson's class, there were Elena and James, Aimee and Jerome, and Janine and Robert, the higher, middle-level, and lower achievers by pairs respectively. Of these 12, 11 were white; Elena, from Atkinson's class, was Hispanic.

Tables 4 and 6 place modal responses of the six interviewees from each class side by side for comparative purposes. I discuss, in order, general trends apparent in the Knowledge Section (questions 1-17 in the preunit interview and 4-20 in the postunit interview represented in Table 4) and the Disposition Section (questions 17-24 in the preunit interview and 21-28 in the post represented in Table 6). Quotations from students also are provided as examples of these trends. Between these two sections, I examine the results of the publisher-supplied test that augment conclusions reached concerning Knowledge Section interview responses.

1. Knowledge Section of the Interview Protocol. The Knowledge Section responses do not reveal the disparity in students' knowledge that appear in the class comparisons on the K-W-Ls. Judging by the frequency of the "I don't know" response in the pre-unit interview, the two classes appear evenly matched at the outset. Most of the six students in each class were uncertain about many

aspects of the American Revolution period in U.S. history. On 13 of the 17 questions in the Knowledge Section, the modal response for both groups of students was "I don't know" or "I'm not sure." Following probes which often represented rephrasings of the questions,

[insert Table 4 about here]

many students in both classes attempted tentative guesses. Sometimes these guesses showed that students did possess some facts and details about the period, but as in the K-W-Ls, these details appeared mostly disconnected and sometimes distorted (McKeown & Beck, 1990). None of this should be surprising given that fifth grade serves as their first experience with chronological, narrative U.S. history. Here are representative examples of students' responses to several preunit questions.

Q #1. The original 13 colonies in North America were settled mostly by English people and were ruled by England. But later they became an independent country--the United States. How did that happen?

Atkinson's Class

ROBERT: Because of the Civil War. [Can you tell me more about that?] It was a big fight for the country over who would rule it. [What was the outcome?] The Washington, D.C. side, I forget what it's called, but they won against the Sacramento side.

JEROME: Part of it was the Declaration of Independence. [Tell me more about that?] I know they wanted their own country. [Do you know how they got their own country?] No.

AIMEE: I think it's because some other colony like Spain or something went to the United States and I think they might have had a battle and maybe they decided they wanted to make it an independent country. [And that's when they called it the United States?] Yes.

Palmer's Class

BARRY: I think there was a war and the other country won it, the land, and they called it the United States. [When you say the other country, who do you mean?] I don't know. [Do you think it was England?] Yeah. [What about the other side?] I'm not sure about that.

LORRIE: I don't know. [Do you know how the United States became the United States?] The Pilgrims came and settled. [Did you know that at one time we were ruled by Great Britain?] No.

ADAM: Well, they decided they didn't want to belong to England and they didn't want to be ruled by them anymore. [Do you know why they decided that?] I don't know.

Q #2: For a long time, the colonists were happy to think of themselves as English and to be ruled by the English king. However, later they changed their minds. Why?

Atkinson's Class

JAMES: I don't know exactly. Maybe England tried to make it too much their way and didn't give the settlers choices. Maybe it as the King of England's choice or he made them do the religions. He didn't give them a choice and they decided to rebel. [Are you sure about this or are you kind of guessing?] I'm kind of guessing.

ELENA: I don't know.

Palmer's Class

ABIGAIL: They didn't get their own rights. [What do you mean?] Their religion. They weren't really free. [I think you're talking about why the colonists left England in the first place. I'm talking about 175 years later. Later they decided they didn't want to be ruled by the English. Do you know why?] I probably do but I can't really think of it.

FREDERIC: I don't know.

LARA: The English kind might have made some laws that they didn't really like. I'm guessing.

Q #3: What were some of the problems caused by the French and Indian War?

Atkinson's Class

AIMEE: I have heard of it but I haven't studied it so I don't know.

JAMES: Well, one thing I've heard is that it was really mean what they did. They hired some country and England teamed up with the Indians and made them attack the French and like if you chopped someone's head off, they gave you money for it. I forgot what country it was but they teamed up with the Indians or with the French and with every head you cut off or brought back, you would get a certain amount of money for it. It was really a vicious war.

Palmer's Class

BARRY: I don't know. We didn't study that yet.

LORRIE: Death. [Have you heard of the French and Indian War before?] No.

ADAM: The French and Indians had a war.

Q #5: What was the Boston Tea Party? (Probes: Why did they dump the tea into the ocean instead of just taking it home with them? Do you think it was a good idea to do this?)

Atkinson's Class

JANINE: They gathered and a whole bunch of people in Boston, the English, they threw a bunch of things in the water or something, but I can't remember what. [They threw tea in the harbor. Do you know why they did that?] No.

Palmer's Class

LORRIE: I think it was when the queen invited a lot of people for a tea party. (Interviewer explains Boston Tea Party.) I've heard of it before but I've never studied it.

JEROME: Well, they raised taxes on tea and the colonists didn't like that at all so they dressed up like Indians and dumped a lot of tea into the ocean. [Actually it was Boston Harbor.] They dumped the tea in. [Why didn't they just steal it? Why do you think they dumped it into the harbor?] Well, they were very mad about it and I don't think they liked the taxes on the tea. I don't know. They probably wanted to get rid of it. [What happens to tea when it gets wet?] It just washes away and stuff. [Why didn't they just steal it and take it home with them?] I don't really know. [Do you think that was a good idea to throw all that tea in the harbor?] Sort of. I'm not sure what their reason was.

LARA: It's when some Indians dressed up and threw the tea overboard from the ship. It happened in England I think. [It said "Boston" Tea Party.] Oh, then in Boston. [Why did they dump the tea in the water?] Because that's what everybody drinks in Boston. [Why dump it in the water?] I don't know. [Where did you learn about this?] My dad taught me about it. He helps us with school.

FREDERIC: A meeting of some sort. [Tell me more.] I'm not sure exactly who attended it. [Why do you think they called it the Boston Tea Party?] I don't know, but I used to be interested in wars and that kind of thing.

ADAM: I'm not really sure but I've heard of it before.

Q #7: What was in the Declaration of Independence? What does it say?

Atkinson's Class

AIMEE: It said that everybody could vote and that they would be treated equal and they'd all have a fair chance in court and they'd be able to ...nobody was innocent until proven innocent. [When you use words like declaration of independence, what do those words mean?] Independence is like being able to do things by yourself without help from other people. [So these people were saying, "We declare independence," but from what?] Probably from having to pay taxes and having to be told what to do. [Who was telling them?] Probably like the mayor of the government or whoever was in charge.

Palmer's Class

BARRY: I have a copy of it at home. [Tell me what you can remember about it.] I don't know. It says something at the top but I can't remember what.

LORRIE: I don't know. [It was to declare independence for whom?] The people living there.

Q #10: Eventually, the Revolutionary War started and fighting broke out between English soldiers and American patriots. Do you know what happened and why?

Atkinson's Class

AIMEE: I think the patriots that wanted to break away, I think they must have won a battle and gone and found America after Columbus found it or they probably found a different part of it so they decided they'd settle there. [Were the patriots successful at breaking away from England?] Yes.

Palmer's Class

LORRIE: Well, they wanted to kill each other. [Do you know who won?] I think it was the Redcoats. [The English?] Yes.

JAMES: Well, I know England brought some ships over and attacked, and of course the Patriots probably set up some forts on the coast or something like that. I guess probably the Patriots actually won. Otherwise, they would be ruling part of America right now. We haven't studied much about the Revolutionary War. Mostly we studied a little bit about the Civil War last year.

ADAM: I know about Paul Revere running through the town saying, "The Red Coats are coming." [What was he doing?] He was warning the town that the English were attacking because it was late at night. [Can you tell me anymore? Did they fight for a long time or was it over really fast or what?] I get mixed up with all these wars. There was something like an eight-day war or something. [Who won the war?] The Patriots.

Q #13. What happened after the war was over?

Atkinson's Class

ROBERT: I'm not sure. [All this fighting had been going on between the patriots and the English soldiers. Eventually that war was over. Do you know what happened then?] Another fight broke out, like the Civil War, but I'm not sure.

AIMEE: I think the patriots got to break away in the end and they decided they would and they did. [Then what happened?] I guess they decided to start settling and it must have worked. They might have gotten help from other colonies like Spain or other kings to help them found their own country.

Palmer's Class

LORRIE: Everybody had freedom. [Who do you mean, everybody?] The people that lived in the government or the country. [Which country?] Colonies.

ADAM: I'm not sure about that. I don't know.

FREDERIC: We got our freedom.

LARA: They made peace. [Who?] The Redcoats and the Americans. [Who won the war?] The Redcoats. [No, it was the Patriots. What happened then?] George Washington.

Significant changes occurred in students' thinking following the unit. Data from both classes suggest that students came away from the unit with a much improved sense of the events, people, terms, and possible causal connections of the period under study. Notable decreases in the "I don't know" response were observed (modal for one group or the other in only 3 of the 17 questions). Most of the six students in each class recalled and frequently explained key ideas, terms, and causal relationships that they had learned about the American Revolution (e.g., the war had to do with British tax policy and the desire for colonial independence, the meaning of the phrase "no taxation without representation", the standard explanation of the Boston Tea Party, a sense of the purpose of the Declaration of Independence, etc.).

The most notable differences in students' recollections about the period (displayed in Table 4) related to the differential emphasis that Palmer and Atkinson placed on various aspects of the American Revolution period. For example, Atkinson's students appeared better informed about

the struggle and contention over the ratification of the Constitution. She had stressed this topic in the closing days of the unit. Palmer had downplayed it in favor of spending more time on the historical "aliveness" of the Bill of Rights (see the last several protocol questions on Table 4 where differences in modal responses between classes are most apparent). Consistent with Palmer's focus on the nature of the historical record, her six students had slightly better recall of the events that began the war, noting particularly that historians do not know who fired the first shot (none of Atkinson's students mentioned this). Palmer's students also were quicker to recall key characters (male and female) during the period. This may be traceable to her use of historical fiction which focused on the stories of individual people who lived during the period.

Q #17: How were the 13 United States different from the 13 colonies?

Atkinson's Class

JAMES: They didn't have any sort of government and so people didn't have to pay taxes. They couldn't do anything about it. So then they wrote the Constitution and it took awhile for that to pass because they had to have nine of the 13 colonies ratify it. At first no one would ratify it but then 7 wanted to ratify it and then they said they would add the Bill of Rights if they all would ratify it. They didn't have any formal government but I suppose they named a leader but I don't think they had any formal government. [Did they have other problems too?] They had no laws so people could pretty much do whatever they want.

ROBERT: They had to bring their country together and at first it was OK, then they had problems and they tried to make the Constitution of Independence and 10 of the colonies had to ratify it and they had sort of a war to ratify it. [What do you mean ratify?] To say that they wanted the Constitution. Only 10 had to ratify it.

Palmer's Class

BARRY: They got representatives to make laws and it would be the president, the representatives, and the colonists. It was like presidents but not as high as the presidents. They just made laws and helped the president decide.

LORRIE: The British didn't have to rule. The people ruled themselves. [How did they do that?] Well, we have a government and president that rules sort of, but they don't raise taxes. They just keep the tax how much it is. [How did they figure out to have a president?] They just made up the government.

LARA: I don't know. [They're no longer under British rule. So who's in charge?] George Washington. [So how did he get to be in charge? Did he just wake up one day and say "I'm the new king of the United States?"] No, I think he was the only general that survived or something.

Q #18: How did the people form a government for their new country called the United States? What did they do?

Atkinson's Class

Palmer's Class

ROBERT: Well, they got people in a room and they talked about how it would be good to ratify and some talked about how bad it would be if they ratified. [How did they write the Constitution?] Well, they wrote it and they had a big discussion if they wanted it or if they didn't want it. [Why did they have to have a Constitution? Why didn't they just make some other kind?] They wanted it to hold the country together and some just didn't think they needed it. [So who won the argument?] The people who wanted to ratify it.

LORRIE: They had meetings. [Who met?] The most important people like the people who wrote the Declaration of Independence and George Washington and a lot of other people.

LARA: They had a meeting or something I guess.

AIMEE: They decided that they wanted to pick certain people they thought were upper class and they would vote and they decided to make a president, a vice president, a secretary and then representatives and eventually they had the judicial and legislative. [How did they decide to do all that?] They figured out a president and vice president and then governor and then they decided they needed more representatives so they persuaded more people to become secretaries and other things surrounding the president.

ADAM: They decided they didn't want to have a king and they wanted to let the people run the government. [Who decided this?] I don't know. [Was it all the people or a group of people or did they write this down someplace, or what?] A group of people like George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. [Any women?] I don't know.

JAMES: The leaders who were not formal leaders said they needed to do something and they started to write a Constitution and it took them awhile. They talked to the states and the states said they wouldn't ratify it unless they put in some rights. [How long did all this take?] I think it took two to four years after the war.

FREDERIC: I think they had three groups. Representatives, senators (pause) [How did they decide to make those groups and who decided?] I'm not sure. I don't quite get what you're saying. [How did they decide to form this new government and who decided?] I'm not sure. I think they eventually just kind of put it together.

Q #15: Who were some of the women involved in the Revolution?

Atkinson's Class

JEROME: I can't remember when they only had one tax, she led them to keep boycotting the tea tax because they didn't want any tax. I forgot her name but she just kept the boycott going so people wouldn't buy tea. [Anybody else you can think of?] I can't really remember anyone else.

JANINE: Betsy Ross--she made the flag. [Who else?] I don't know.

Palmer's Class

LORRIE: Molly Pitcher didn't fight in the war but she wrote poems about the war. [Why did they call her Molly Pitcher?] Her real name I think was Mary. They called her Molly Pitcher cause she wrote poems. I don't know any more.

FREDERIC: Molly Pitcher. She was a maid and she did a little bit of fighting.

AIMEE: I think one's name was Abigail Adams. I can remember what some of the women did but I can't remember their names. Lots of them dressed up like soldiers and went and fought in the war and some of them wrote poems to inspire the generals and some were spies and some made gun powder and some of them were nurses. I'm not sure what the names are but I'm sure there was a lot of them.

ADAM: Molly Pitcher helped the soldiers. She nursed them and carried water and stuff and there were some spies like like in Phoebe the Spy.

LARA: 15. Molly Pitcher. Most of the people died and she fought off the British and she got water to the people who were dying.

Slight differences in the degree of empathy students manifested also emerged in their responses to the postunit question that asked them to state whether they thought the Boston Tea Party was a good idea or not. For example, Atkinson's students, more so than Palmer's, appeared to understand the Boston Tea Party from both a colonial and British perspective, thereby displaying a degree of empathy with each group in the contest. Several of Palmer's students seemed to demonstrate a stronger colonial bias. Here are several examples.

Q #8 (probe): Do you think the Boston Tea Party was a good idea?

Atkinson's Class
JEROME: A loyalist wouldn't have liked it because they were loyal to the king and I guess they didn't mind paying tax on tea. They were wealthier than other people. They didn't want to be all on their own so they probably thought it wasn't a good idea to do that to make the British mad.

Palmer's Class
BARRY: [Why didn't they just take the tea home?] Cause they wanted to make King George upset and eventually maybe he'd lower the tax. [Was it a good idea to do that?] To get King George mad, yeah, but not to waste tea.

ELENA: I don't see how the colonists would want to have all those taxes but...they were trying to make the British take off all those taxes but I think the British probably just got more angry with them for doing that. I think the British were doing them a favor by not making them make all those rules by themselves, but the colonists didn't think that. They just thought the British just wanted to get money from them. [Do you see two sides to the issue?] Yeah. The British fought in the French and Indian War and it made the colonies a lot safer from Indian attacks and stuff and they needed money to pay off that debt. The British probably thought they had done something nice for them and they should help by helping pay off the debt. [Do you think the colonists went too far in doing some of these things?] Yeah. [Do you think the whole war could have been avoided?] I think so, if the colonists hadn't done so much protesting and stuff and instead tried to send people to talk to King George and the government to see if they could understand that the British weren't just trying to be mean and rule everything.

FREDERIC: Yeah, because it showed the British that we meant business and we weren't messing around and it was something they just had to do.

LORRIE: I would think it would be. [Why?] They were raising the taxes and I would have done that [throw tea in the harbor] too.

A similar difference emerged in the postunit question which dealt with how King George may have felt about the colonists (postunit question 11). The slightly higher sense of empathy for King George's frustration with colonial resistance projected by Atkinson's students (although students from both classes displayed it) could be attributable to her more explicit emphasis on assuming differing points of view in history and in life in general.

Q #11: The colonists wanted to break away from England because they thought the king was treating them unfairly. What do you think King George thought about the colonists?

Atkinson's Class
ROBERT: He probably thought they were unfair to him because they started doing stuff that he didn't like, saying they wanted some say. [Do you think he was right?] Yeah, but I also think he was doing unfair things to them.

Palmer's Class
LORRIE: He probably thought he should lower the taxes on tea, but he did and no one bought the tea anyway. [Do you think the colonists' behavior made him mad?] Yeah, but he didn't have a right to punish them. [Why?] Because I would have done that too.

JANINE: [He] probably thought that wasn't really fair. [Do you think he was mad at the colonists?] Probably a little bit. [Do you think he had a right to be upset?] Yeah. [Do you think the colonists should have been more loyal to the king?] Probably. [Do you think maybe the king was passing too many taxes?] Yeah.

FREDERIC: I think he would be kind of mad that they tried to start their own country. I don't think he liked the colonists. [Do you think he was mad that they dumped tea in the harbor?] He should be mad if we did it for no reason, but we said we didn't want these taxes and he didn't listen, so it had to happen. I think all of the British should have paid some. I think he took it too far.

AIMEE: He thought it was fair but he didn't really like the idea because he was losing most of his subjects. [Do you think he had a right to be upset because the colonists were declaring independence?] He kind of did and kind of didn't. He had a right to be upset because he was losing most of his subjects but he shouldn't be upset because they felt he was treating them too hard and that was the only way to get through to him. [Who do you think was right?] Probably the colonists' side, but I can see both sides of it.

LARA: He thought what he was doing was fair and didn't really care what the colonists thought because he was the king and he got to do whatever he wanted. [When the colonists threw tea in the harbor, do you think that made him angry?] Yes, because he owned that tea. [Do you think he had a right to be angry with the colonists?] No, because he was treating the colonists unfairly.

Overall, with the exception of the differences just noted, the modal responses of the 12 students to the postunit Knowledge Section protocol were similar. This conclusion suggests several interpretations: (a) each teacher, in her own fashion, succeeded fairly well in reaching her knowledge transmission goals (although these goals might be criticized by some for their general colonial bias and standard, textbook orientation); (b) the differences in knowledge of the period suggested by the K-W-L forms can be seen as misleading if we assume that the responses of six students from each class are representative of the whole; and (c) perceived pressure to cover the material as specified by the district curriculum guidelines influenced the teachers' curriculum gatekeeping practices, but did so in way that allowed them to keep the gate open fairly wide. The latter, in turn, may have worked to assist their students' ability to reconstruct information about the period. However, this content-coverage pressure was not without its costs, especially in Atkinson's case. I return to this as a trade-off issue later.

2. Comparative Test Results. Test results bolster the conclusion that students' knowledge gain and recall were similarly enhanced by each teacher's treatment of the unit. Table 5 displays the comparative results on the multiple-choice sections of this test.

[insert Table 5 about here]

Multiple Choice Section A on the test measured factual recall of the historical record presented in Chapter 7 ("The Road To Independence") of the Silver Burdett and Ginn textbook, *The United States Yesterday and Today* (Helmus et al., 1988). Section B consisted of five short-answer essay questions which also directly addressed a student's ability to recall details presented in the chapter. Section C, also multiple-choice items, presented a paragraph taken directly from the textbook, then asked students to answer a series of questions based on that paragraph. This was essentially a reading comprehension exercise because the answers were (ostensibly) in the text itself.

As Table 5 indicates, the results of the multiple-choice section of the test were almost identical. Comparisons on the essay section of the test are difficult because the teachers used different "grading methods" to assess the quality of responses. However, the essay questions did call for primarily factual answers. Examining student samples suggested that differences were minimal. Most of the students in each class did reasonably well on the questions that they answered (Atkinson's students had a choice about which questions they would address). To the extent that these tests are valid and reliable measures of textbook knowledge, the comparative results provide more evidence for the conclusion that there were only slight knowledge-recall differences between the two classes. These differences appeared related to the patterns of content detail emphasized by each teacher, rather than differences in the amount of knowledge developed overall.

3. Disposition Section of the Interview Protocol. In this section of the interview protocol, differences appeared in rather subtle forms that seemed to reflect each teacher's different orientation to the interaction between curricular goals, organizational style, and approach to history: Palmer's to a more scientific and controlling side of the ledger, Atkinson's to a more reformist and participatory side.

Exposure to democratic ideas and principles in the study of the American Revolution period had only partial influence on changing students' thinking about these historic notions. One reason for this was that students in both classes had demonstrated general dispositions toward democratic

principles in the preunit interview. Here most of them, as reflected in their modal responses, indicated an interest in and value for negotiation, participation, and compromise. Atkinson's students, responding to the preunit question about differing interpretations of history, did display a second modal response. This suggests that they may have had a deeper initial appreciation for their value. Both groups communicated that people have a right to express their opinions and that they were allowed to do this in class. Both made suggestions about and were amenable to pursuing improvements in the quality of life in their communities and in the nation as a whole. Both groups favored group work or work done in pairs over individually assigned classroom activities, suggesting a disposition toward shared, communal activities. Finally, on the whole, they demonstrated a positive regard for the process of democratic decision making indicated by their stress on the importance of voting.

[insert Table 6 about here]

These "predispositions" may have had their roots in family attitudes and values or in the teachers' classroom practices that antedated this mid-year study. Along with these common dispositions, however, there were subtle differences between the two groups of students. These appeared in both the pre- and postunit responses rather than in pre-post changes emerging from experiences specific to the unit.

Atkinson's students appeared more influenced by democratic, participatory orientations and personal rights than did Palmer's. For example, both before and after the unit, Atkinson's six students emphasized that, with respect to classroom decisions, voting ought to be the method by which matters were resolved. Although, when pressed with probes, three students did shift their positions somewhat, allowing "teachers" and other "authorities" more discretionary power in decisions. Palmer's students tended to be more circumspect. Only three said initially that voting was the key, and after probing, two added that voting should follow a discussion. Barry and Frederic noted that "no key issue had come up" in Palmer's class that necessitated an important decision. In the postunit interview (question 27), students were probed to find out to what extent voting procedures should, in their opinion, be applied. Elena and Robert from Atkinson's class

modified their earlier stress on voting by giving the teacher more authority over classroom decisions. By contrast, all six of Palmer's students noted Palmer's control over what they learned, and Lorrie and Frederic stressed that students should not be allowed to choose what they learned.

Q #27: How do you think important decisions should be made here in this class?

Atkinson's Class

ROBERT: Well, vote on them. [Everything?] Yeah. [Even what your teacher is going to teach you?] Well, not what she's going to teach you because she probably knows better than you what to teach. But you could vote on classroom rules. [Do you think second graders ought to have a say on what goes on in their classes?] Yeah, cause they're people just like others.

JAMES: With a democracy vote, which is how we do it now. [Explain that to me.] You have a vote and majority wins. [Sometimes if you have 26 kids and 14 vote for an idea and 12 say no, and you have 12 kids who are disappointed, what do you do about that?] Sometimes you just have to go that way. There's not a whole lot you can do about things like that. If it was indoor recess and we had to vote on something to do, if we took so long to find what every single kid in our room wanted to do, that would take the whole recess.

ELENA: I think everyone could kind of have an equal say and I think they should be able to talk about it and decide what they think, but the teacher should have the most power but not all the power and be able to make the final decision, but first listen to what the kids have to say and what they think about things. [Why do you think the teacher should have more power than the kids?] Kind of because if the teacher is hired to teach and they should have more power.

Palmer's Class

LORRIE: Sometimes by the teacher and sometimes by kids. [Why?] I don't know. You want the kids to know more so the kids should say more than the teacher. [Give me an example of each?] When most students are raising their hand, the teacher should make the decision and when a lot of kids are raising their hands and the majority is with the kids, then the kids should make the decisions. [Who should make the decision about what you're learning about in school?] Our parents. [Do you think kids should decide what they're learning about in school?] No. [Why not?] Because we might not want to learn something important.

FREDERIC: I think the whole class should be able to make important decisions, as one. [How would you do that?] It would be good to have someone besides the teacher decide things. We should be able to all come to a vote or a consensus about something. [Do you think you should be able to vote on what you're learning about in school?] No, I don't think so. I think the teacher is smarter than the kids. She's had a complete education and we haven't, so she should be able to choose what we should learn. We could have input but not like a big vote.

ABIGAIL: Voting. Talking about it. [Do you think you should be able to decide what you're going to learn about in school?] In grade school no. [Why not?] I think you need to learn certain things and I don't think anybody's going to say I want to learn about science. You still have to learn science even if you don't like it. A lot of people don't like math but it's in just about every job and so you need to know it. If you had a choice, it would be too hard to decide. There's pleasurable things and there's things you need to know.

Related differences can be observed in other responses. For example, in preunit question 19, Frederic observed that Palmer kept discussions/arguments under control, and in postunit question 23, Lara explained that in class it is acceptable to disagree with Palmer, but "if it comes up on a test, she's right." No one made these kind of observations about Atkinson, although several of her students did indicate the importance of history books, rather than their own opinions, as authoritative. These differences in responses likely relate to the teacher's approaches and the openness or closedness of the classroom decision-making process. An open process serviced Atkinson's approach and style more effectively than Palmer's.

Q #19: What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in American history than other kids in class?

Atkinson's Class	Palmer's Class
AIMEE: Then it's probably like your own 'prerogative'. You have your own reasons and why you think this happened, and someone else may think something else. [And that's OK?] Yup. [So you're entitled to your opinion?] Yeah. [What if you argue a lot?] You can just try to solve the problem by saying, "You can think what you want to think and I'll think what I want to think."	FREDERIC: It's OK to disagree with things. [So how do you figure that out?] That's happened in math before. We just had a discussion. It wasn't an argument. [Does your teacher lead these discussions?] Yes, she keeps them under control.
JAMES: It's OK. Everybody has the right to their own opinion. [Do you practice this in class, that everybody has a right to their own opinion?] Yeah. We're also going to have debates later on. [What are debates all about?] You debate the pros and the cons of the issue. One side is pro, one side is con. Kind of like a lawyer. Even if you don't believe the right one, you still have to try to make it seem right. It's almost like arguing with your brother, just a little less formal.	LARA: It's OK. [What happens if you disagree?] We look it up. [What do you mean?] We look in our book and see what it says or maybe the teacher will look it up. [What if you look it up in a teacher's book and it says a third thing?] You take the teacher's book because historical writers said it. [What happens if you looked it up and you still didn't believe it? Could they make a mistake in the book?] Yeah. [Is it still OK that you have a different idea?] Yeah. [How do you decide?] We just leave it.

Q #23: What happens if your idea about American history is different than your teacher's? What happens then?

Atkinson's Class	Palmer's Class

ROBERT: Well, she could be wrong or you could be wrong and still you can have a different idea and work it out and you could change your idea. [What do you mean 'work it out?'] You could talk about it and then you might have different feelings about it. [You'd have to talk about it with each other?] If you wanted to. Like if you really thought it was this way and she really thought it was a different way, then if you talked it out, you might have different feelings about it. [Do you think your teacher thinks it's OK to have different ideas than her?] Yeah.

LARA: That's OK. [You don't necessarily have to believe what she believes?] Right. You can believe in what you say, but if it comes up on a test, you have to do what the teacher believes.

ABIGAIL: It's OK. It would probably be hard. You could argue with her and you wouldn't get in trouble. You have the right. Also, I don't think the teachers are supposed to tell kids what to believe.

Those who have surveyed the political socialization literature (e.g., Angell, 1991; Ferguson, 1991) note how difficult it is to trace changes in democratic citizenship dispositions to the influence of particular teachers. In general, consistent experiences across grades in classrooms where authority over decisions is shared among participants point to gains in the type of democratic dispositions valued by social studies curriculum theorists (e.g., Parker and Jarolimek, 1984). Changing dispositions appears to be a long-term and cumulative phenomenon.[8] Even if Atkinson is a good example of a teacher with strongly articulated democratic classroom goals, her influences on students might easily be countered by more control-minded middle school teachers (particularly if these teachers are the "defensive" type described by McNeil [1986] in her research). Furthermore, Atkinson's students may have been partly wary of her goals if they had not previously encountered teachers who seemed willing to share classroom control and solicit student participation. In this sense, her influence might also be muted. However, it remains possible that Atkinson's "democratic days" were evenly balanced with her "non-democratic days" (her terms), making her, in some ways, more similar to Palmer.

Finally, small differences emerged in the miscellaneous questions asked only in the post-unit interview (see the last four questions on Table 6). With regard to students' attitudes about the unit, the modal response in both classes indicated that the unit stimulated their interests. However, what specific topics they chose varied relative to differences in the teachers' curricular mediation practices. For example, four students in Atkinson's class noted the struggle over the Constitution's ratification (stressed by Atkinson) as most interesting, while no one in Palmer's

class made a similar observation. Several of Palmer's students chose instead the discussion of the Constitutional amendments and the "taxes" simulation exercise as the most notable classroom activities.

Two of Atkinson's students recalled that history involved learning about "mistakes" of the past, a comment not made by Palmer's students. Other than this qualitative difference, student definitions of history were alike (postunit question 1). Both groups of students had some difficulty providing a rationale for why they learned history in school (9 offered that it helped you know what happened in the past and why without much further qualification). They also struggled with how history might help them in their lives away from school (the modal response was, "I'm not sure"). However, Atkinson's students were somewhat more articulate and quick to respond to postunit question 2 than were Palmer's. Elena's comment, for example, did suggest a rationale in line with Atkinson's present-oriented, reformist purview. Elena, however, did not attribute the rationale directly to Atkinson. Half of Palmer's students said at one point that they were not sure of a rationale. On postunit question 3, concerning the value of history for life away from school, both groups of students tended to provide rather utilitarian responses.

Q #1: What do you think history is?

Atkinson's Class	Palmer's Class
ROBERT: I think basically it's what happened in the past. [Anything else?] It's how to learn what happened in the past and learn from our mistakes. [Is history everything that happened in the past?] The most important things that happened in the past.	LORRIE: Things that happened in the past. [Everything or just certain things?] Certain things. [Like what?] Like the Revolutionary War is history. [How about when you were born and took your first step?] That's history. [You also said that not everything in the past was history. What do you mean?] Well, maybe everything is. I don't know.
JAMES: I think basically it's what happened in the past. [Anything else?] It's how to learn what happened in the past and learn from our mistakes. [Is history everything that happened in the past?] The most important things that happened in the past.	LARA: It talks about the past. [Tell me more.] It's dates that we write down. [Is history anything that happened even a few seconds ago and before that?] Yeah. If you're writing in your diary, it could be history.

Q #2: Why do you think they teach you history in school?

Atkinson's Class	Palmer's Class

AIMEE: Probably because it's important because when you get into older grades or decide you want to get a job, history may be important. [Explain that to me.] You might have to know lots of stuff about it because you might have to do a quiz or something on history, like if you had to do a play or something, you'd have to research a lot of history, but if you already knew most of it, you wouldn't have to do much research.

LORRIE: `Cause you might want to be a teacher when you grow up and you might have to know history in some jobs if you want to get a job. [What if you wanted to be a truck driver? Why would you need to know history for that?] I don't know. You'd need geography. [Why do you think everyone should know about history?] They might change their minds. [Why do you think teachers and parents think it's so important for all kids?] Maybe they just want them to know. [Why?] So you can be smart.

ELENA: I think so you'll know what things happened in the past and how they happened. If you didn't know history, you wouldn't understand a lot of stuff that's current now. [I don't know what you mean? Do you mean knowing about the past helps you to know about now? How do you mean?] If you know about what happened a long time ago, then it's easier to learn stuff about now and what might happen in the future. If you know that something in the past went wrong, it helps you know what to do now.

FREDERIC: We're in school to learn. [Why history?] If you're born in America, it seems like you should know what happened before you were born and how America became America. If it didn't, then we wouldn't be here. [Why is that important to know about?] I don't know. It's hard to explain.

Q #3: How might learning history help you in your life away from school?

Atkinson's Class

ROBERT: Well, if you didn't have history and learn everything you do in school, if you go out something bad could happen to you. [So if you knew about history, you could avoid that?] Yeah.

AIMEE: It might be fun to quiz your friends or . . . [Kind of like history trivia?] Yes. [How else might it help you?] I'm not sure. [You said something about a job.] Well, it might help you in a job if you were someone who was in the legislate, judicial, or executive branch, you might need to know something about the Constitution so that if a new law was brought up, you might be able to say, "All right. It comes under the Fifth Amendment."

Palmer's Class

LORRIE: I might have to study for a test. [What about your life away from school? Do you think you need to know about history?] Yeah, so you can know it the next day.

ABIGAIL: You could teach your parents something. My sister and my dad talk a lot at dinner. Half the time I don't know what they're talking about but sometimes if they talk about something I know about, I can put my two cents in.

ADAM: (long pause) So you can tell your parents when they ask you what you did in school. [How is it important for you personally?] I don't know.

In general, the responses to these several questions suggest that Atkinson's students had a broader sense of the value of learning history or at least were able to articulate a rationale. This may be connected to Atkinson's emphasis on history as a tool for solving problems and informing

decisions. Her reformist approach and the way she modeled history as a tool apparently held some currency with her students, perhaps because it pointed up connections to their lives. Palmer, by contrast, never offered a direct rationale for historical study to her students during the research period. She did mention it in interviews. She explained that she had discussed the importance of "knowing about one's past," about "historian's work," at the beginning of the year.

Summary of Student Learning

When the data on what students were learning about the content covered in the American Revolution unit are taken as a whole, the results suggest that the two classes of students were evenly matched. That is, after initially indicating only sketchy knowledge of the period, most students were able to reconstruct a much more detailed and coherent account of the major events of the period. Students also demonstrated cognizance of differing points of view while displaying some empathy for these differences. Students from both classes appeared conscious of the need to support points of view with evidence. Both groups also increased their knowledge of some causal connections related to the period (e.g., the French and Indian War "caused" changes in British tax policy, British tax policy was connected to colonial resistance).

Nonetheless, reflecting the gatekeeping practices of the teachers, qualitative variations in students' ideas emerged, particularly in the interview data. Palmer's students appeared more concerned with details relative to quantity of evidence presented to support assertions. Therefore, they were more focused on the historical record itself and concerned about event representations. Atkinson's students tended to appreciate point of view and turn this appreciation in the direction of assessing, addressing, and avoiding past mistakes. In the classroom, Palmer's students were more cautious in their reactions to what they were learning. Atkinson's students raised more questions and were more curious. These latter differences relate to the way the teachers structured opportunities for classroom discourse.

Variations also appeared in responses to questions on the importance of learning history and on democratic dispositions enhanced and/or modified by the unit. Because Atkinson tried more consistently than Palmer to operate a democratic classroom, her students displayed greater

willingness to defer to democratic processes in how they solved problems and in how classroom decisions were made. Palmer's students were also comfortable with this process but indicated slightly quicker to deference to authoritative sources when problems or issues arose. Atkinson's students also articulated a slightly more global and present sense of how learning history was important to their lives (e.g., using history to inform/reform current problems, avoiding the mistakes of the past). Palmer's students tended to offer more distal and narrowly utilitarian responses to questions of rationale (e.g., you could help your children study for their history tests). What and how students appeared to be learning in Atkinson's classroom appeared more consistent with current theory. Yet, the learning process in her classroom retained some features of more traditional, direct-instruction models. This paradox is addressed in various ways in the next section.

Discussion

This study raises a number of interrelated questions. Among them are those that turn on issues of curriculum scope and sequence in history education, the trade-offs for teachers and students embedded in them, and the teaching-learning relationship relative to the application of current learning theories to the domain of history education.

Trade-offs, Curriculum Issues, and Student Learning

In Wineburg and Wilson's (1988, 1991) case studies of two high school history teachers, they used the metaphor "peering at history through different lenses" to describe the differences they observed. The same metaphor may apply to Palmer and Atkinson (although in a different fashion than it was used in the Wineburg and Wilson study). Palmer tends to peer at U.S. history (the American Revolution period in particular) as important in its own right (Howard & Mendenhall, 1982), as part of the historical record scientific historians find valuable for their disciplinary purposes (Evans, 1989). Atkinson peers at it more from a reformist perspective (Evans, 1989), a position which contemporanizes history and employs it as a tool to reflect on and make decisions about recurring social problems and issues (Banks, 1991; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hunt & Metcalf, 1968).

If we attend to the content of the unit and what students were able to reconstruct about it, the trade-offs inherent in peering at history from one lens as opposed to the other appear nominal. Both teachers focused in depth on key historical issues and avoided getting mired in the morass of facts. Each, in different ways, made the subject matter meaningful, interesting, and relevant to students. Content representation showed thematic coherence as in a well-crafted story. The post-unit data indicate that the teachers were reasonably successful in accomplishing this much with their students. Therefore, both are notable in that they demonstrate considerable improvements over common parades-of-facts approaches. Nevertheless, one might conclude that Atkinson's effort to expand her goals--beyond the importance of the record historian's have crafted--presents students with a wider array of learning opportunities than those to which Palmer's students had access.

For example, even though the data concerning participatory citizenship dispositions demonstrate only subtle differences among students, results on these and other questions suggest that Atkinson exposed her students to more opportunities to explicitly question and evaluate a segment of U.S. history from the perspective of their own lives and their place in time. Such opportunities seem to have rich and perhaps long-term learning potentialities. In this sense, the gatekeeping trade-offs may favor the type of history teaching employed by Atkinson. Put another way, despite her reformist-presentist lens, Atkinson was able both to deepen her students' knowledge of the historical record and add another layer of learning opportunities. In short, her choice of lens appears more consistent with current constructivist theories of teaching and learning.

Implications for Teachers

For the teachers themselves, the trade-offs involved in choosing different lenses impact more deeply. As one example, pursuing goals that involve students in some of the deliberations necessary to construct their own learning experiences, as Atkinson tried to do, requires giving up a measure of control. Atkinson's attempts to model practices that involved questioning authoritative sources, raising contemporary implications, and asking students to evaluate what they were learning may have made her life more troublesome than if she had operated her classroom more the

way Palmer did. By foregrounding her understanding of the subject matter of history, Palmer could rely on its implicit order (chronological sequence, disciplinary structure) to organize instruction. She thereby avoided some of the potential time-use frustrations and organizational dilemmas Atkinson faced.

To foreground goals that involve questioning history to "address the mistakes of the past" and then finding corollaries in the present is to make classroom organization even more problematic. If curriculum policy pays lip service to these goals but mandates content coverage, this creates layers of complexity and exudes mixed messages. Time remains crucial. As one's goals expand across, not only the historical knowledge terrain, but also on to the broader landscape of various reform agendas and public policy issues, time management becomes an ever-more pressing concern. From this perspective, Palmer's curriculum mediation/gatekeeping practices (e.g. to more tightly control student discourse) seemed to reduce decision complexities more so than Atkinson's. Palmer's decisions eliminated several opportunities to enhance educational purposes, but gained in organizational stability and predictability. Atkinson strove to attain those broader purposes; then appeared to pay for them through time-management complications.

The kind of trade-offs that result from peering at history from one lens or another suggest that using one lens, such as Atkinson's, may provide additional benefits for students (e.g. divergent questioning, evaluating knowledge, growth in dispositions toward active citizenship). However, they simultaneously exacerbate classroom organization and content-coverage dilemmas. Such dilemmas are quite real for teachers and certainly influence their choices about lenses.

Palmer once said in an interview that she used to debate issues raised by historical study more frequently (not unlike the discussion of the Bill of Rights), but had stopped because, "It takes up too much time." Parents at Matewan, she continued, were concerned with how much their children were learning. Palmer's choice of lens tended to reflect her community. Despite similar pressures at Greenwood, Atkinson persevered in her reformist approach, but appeared to be "teaching against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 1991). Without much support from colleagues and the principal at Greenwood, Atkinson struggled alone while talking of early retirement in informal

interviews. The consequences of choosing different lenses say important things about teaching (and learning) from a constructivist learning theory perspective.

Implications for Current Theory on Teaching and Learning

The path to applying these constructivist theories and research to teaching and learning history seems broken and disconnected for many reasons, the least of which involves the need for more research. However, the matter is compounded by a lack of agreement about elementary and secondary school social studies and history goals (see Banks, 1991; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984, Ravitch, 1987, Reed, 1989; Seixas, 1993; Whelan, 1992; Wilson, 1991). This debate aside, what would a history course and classroom look like that took the current theories seriously? We might assume that they would link up to many of the characteristics Newmann (1990) describes in his "thoughtful social studies classroom" research. In other words, the classroom might look akin to Atkinson's class and portions of Palmer's. They clearly would eschew the textbook-dominated, parades-of-facts approaches some researchers have found to be common in schools (e.g., Goodlad, 1984; Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979).

Specifically, issues would be covered coherently and in depth, emphases would be placed on higher order thinking where students would engage the content conversationally, clarity and justification of ideas would be required, and novel understandings would be rewarded. In short, students would be actively engaged in constructing and evaluating their own historical knowledge as they compared it to that which they were studying (Kobrin, 1992). The teacher would be more facilitative than didactic, more a guide to classroom discussion than a knowledge dispenser. This approach reflects a fundamental shift in how we think about classrooms, teaching, learning, and school organization. Teachers and students may well be caught in the middle.

This metaphorical shift (for example, from "reproduction" of ready-made knowledge to "construction") raises serious dilemmas that teachers and students must address: classroom organization, the use of time, assessment practices, mixed messages about the importance of reproducing and/or constructing knowledge, and so forth. As Atkinson's case suggests, building a learning context around this metaphorical shift is no easy undertaking. And this study falls short

on addressing the sense students made of the conflicting messages they may have received. These messages likely were most acute after Atkinson's illness. The time war Atkinson waged manifested itself in the way discussions and questions about the role of history were truncated when she looked up to notice the clock. Under pressure to "push on," the very participatory and thought-provoking characteristics she believed made her classroom powerful were suppressed to get on to the next chronological point. What did students make of this and how did it influence their understanding of their roles as learners?

If the newer research and theories--such as those offered by Newmann (1990), for example--are to have a passable chance of being endorsed by teachers, then pressure for content coverage (as one instance) would need to abate. Curriculum policy in states and districts would need to endorse depth over breadth (and all that might entail) to permit teachers the comfort level necessary to actively engage students as they pursued thoughtfulness over issues raised by historical study. For example, *survey* U.S. history courses in each of the grades 5 and 8 and again in high school would end. They would be replaced by 3 *period studies* , for example, on early American history in fifth grade, the Nineteenth Century in eighth grade, and the Twentieth Century in high school (National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, 1989), or by pursuing a more topical approach in the upper grades (Engle, 1990). Such approaches would appear more consistent with in-depth study and provide more time for students to engage in, construct, and evaluate what they were learning. It might also allow them to time to construct their own histories.

Detractors of such alternatives might argue that *survey* courses in 3 intervals make sense because of "developmental limitations" in younger students. That is, fifth graders lack the intellectual sophistication to understand the interpretative nature of history and issues related to knowledge-claim criticism and evaluation. Therefore, repetition of content is necessary for mastery. In part this may be accurate. Young students do tend to lack organized frameworks of prior historical knowledge. However, this study of fifth-graders along with those done recently by Brophy, et al. (1992, 1993), Levstik and Pappas (1986, 1989), and VanSledright and Brophy (1992) suggest that these students also are open to the study of history, find it stimulating, and are

able to understand its interpretive, critical, and personal dimensions. The variable common among these studies and that which seems important to learning history, at least in the lower grades, appears to be the speed with which students encounter the content. Apparently, less coverage and a slower pace can result in deeper, more sophisticated learning constructions.

Furthermore, the research by McKeown and Beck (1990) on what sixth graders remembered from their studies of the American Revolution in fifth grade produced rather dismal results. Only about 50% of the sixth graders demonstrated coherent and connected "semantic webs" about key elements of the period. Although McKeown and Beck did not describe the fifth-grade teaching-learning interactions in any detail, they did suggest that the treatment of the American Revolution was textbook oriented and similar to the common parades-of-facts approaches. These disheartening results suggest the need to experiment with different approaches, different metaphors if you will, for teaching history. Tentatively, the experimental what and how point to pedagogical examples described in the more recent studies listed above and in this one.

Few of these ideas should come as any intuitive surprise. However, our research is only just beginning to allow us to draw such tentative conclusions. Much additional research work still needs to be done. For example, longitudinal studies of students' growing (or diminishing) historical knowledge across the often typical three-course American history sequence might be especially helpful. Such studies, if they describe learning in relationship to actual curriculum mediation/gatekeeping practices, would help reduce our speculations about what entering students needed to learn and relearn, and in what way, at the two latter grades particularly. Continued research on alternative approaches to the teaching and learning of history--ones based especially on constructivist learning theories--also must be done. Then we would begin to develop the data necessary to make more interesting and valid comparisons.

Conclusion

Two groups of fifth-grade students taught by two different teachers, who displayed differing goals and curriculum mediation practices, gained considerable understanding and knowledge during their experiences in six-week units on the American Revolution period. The

gains appeared to have their primary source in the influence the teachers had on the students. Both teachers in their own ways constructed lively learning environments, one that emphasized the importance of historical knowledge from a scientific historian-like perspective, the other stressing the need to view history as a tool to make informed decisions and to reform present social problems.

The findings from this study raise a number of questions of interest to policymakers and curriculum developers. For example, the two classroom contexts and the learning processes of students described here suggest that the teachers made a series of decisions about what to foreground as important for students to learn. Such decisions seem to turn in part on ways to embrace and/or avoid teaching dilemmas that arise from competing educational purposes (e.g., the need to "cover" content and the need to explore the subject matter in depth so as to promote higher order thinking, divergent questioning, and the construction and cultivation of novel ideas The data suggest the importance of the latter but also point to how embracing them may make teachers' lives more complicated and uncertain.

This study, along with several others cited, suggests that content coverage for its own sake may fail to accomplish what schools, school districts, and curriculum policymakers hope it will. The recent research suggests credibility for this idea. Implied is the need for additional studies of history classrooms in which teachers already have created contexts for learning that are coherent with the current theory and research on thoughtful classrooms that emphasize conversational approaches, in-depth thought about issues, and active student participation. Such studies would help those interested to make judgments about the viability of the current learning theories for history education at various grade levels. They also would help us understand more about how they are tied to student learning.

Notes

1 I use Parker's (1987) "mediation," and the more recent term "gatekeeping" (Thornton, 1991), interchangeably here. I take the terms to mean interpreting the curriculum and then enacting that interpretation(s). Thornton's gatekeeping metaphor suggests that teachers are in a powerful position: They direct the opening and closing of the curriculum gate and thereby the learning opportunities students encounter. In the latter part of this report, I use the both terms to indicate this control of learning opportunities.

2 Interested readers can obtain more detailed information about the comparative mediation or gatekeeping practices of the two teachers by consulting three related papers ([author], 1992a, 1992b, 1992c).

3 Both teachers might be classified by some as eclectics in that they demonstrate characteristics of other typologies. However, there was enough evidence to suggest that each teacher fit the metaphorical images of the given typologies well enough to justify their use. Furthermore, the typologies were employed, not as imagery carved in granite, but rather as tools to highlight the differences between the teachers. The teachers were also similar in some ways.

4 Evans (1989) noted that the scientific historian and reformist approaches have several things in common. For instance, both see historical details as important but for different reasons: scientific historians because of relationships between those details and evidence for "generalizations," and reformists for what those details can tell us about evidence of historical "mistakes" and their relationship to current social problems. Palmer and Atkinson appeared consistent with these similarities. This may help account for some of the similarities in details of the period students recalled.

5 It must be noted that both of these criteria clusters were developed in connection with secondary teaching practices. Therefore, there use here may be somewhat limited by the nature of these fifth-grade classrooms. Also, no effort to validate these criteria should be inferred from their use. Their application is as much a test of the criteria as it is of the teachers and classrooms.

6 In this discussion, Palmer tended to use history more as a "reformist" might. Some therefore might conclude that associating her with another typology involves a contradiction. This may be partly the case. My high-inference hunch about Palmer is that she used to be more like Atkinson, interested in classroom discourse, debating issues, reforming society. She since had purged her teaching of most of these activities. She focused more on the historical record, events, issues of evidence, more "objective" considerations because they were easier to manage, control, and assess. The discussion was a return to earlier days, a holdover from her "reformist era." I comment about this point again later.

7 As noted, the criteria overlap to the extent that both contain elements consistent with current constructivist theories of learning. As a result, both teachers' gatekeeping practices are notable in that the are departures from the more common, routine, parades-of-facts approach. The trade-offs for these teachers and students occur at the point where emphasis is placed on the importance of disciplinary aspects of history or on the way history might be used to inform/reform social ills.

8 A recent study by Avery and her colleagues (1992) does suggest that a specific curriculum aimed at generating gains in students' "political tolerance" may have positive results.

References

Angell, A.V. (1991). Democratic climates in elementary school classrooms: A review of theory and research. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 19*, 241-266.

Armento, B. (1986). Research on teaching social studies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 942-951). New York: Macmillan.

Avery, P.G., Bird, K., Johnstone, S., Sullivan, J.L., & Thalhammer, K. (1992). Do all the people have all of the rights all of the time? Exploring political tolerance with adolescents. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*, 386-420.

Bailyn, B. (1967). *The ideological origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Banks, J.A. (1991). Social science knowledge and citizenship education. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners* (pp. 117-128). New York: Teachers College Press.

Barber, B. (1989). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. *Social Education, 53*, 355-356; 370.

Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies.

Beard, C.A. (1913/1935). *An economic interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*. New York: Macmillan.

Beloff, M. (1949/1963). *The debate on the American Revolution, 1761-1783*. London: Adam & Charles Black.

Berti, A., & Bombi, A. (1988). *A child's construction of economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brophy, J. (1990). Teaching social studies for understanding and higher-order applications. *The Elementary School Journal, 90*, 351-417.

Brophy, J., VanSledright, B., & Bredin, N. (1992). Fifth graders' ideas about history expressed before and after their introduction to the subject. *Theory and Research in Social*

Education, 20, 440-489.

Brophy, J., VanSledright, B., & Bredin, N. (1993). What do entering fifth graders know about U.S. history? *Journal of Social Studies Research, 16 & 17*, 2-22.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*, 279-310.

Dickinson, A., & Lee, P. (1984). Making sense of history. In A. Dickinson, P. Lee, & P. Rogers (eds.), *Learning history* (pp. 117-153). London: Heinemann.

Downey, M.T., & Levstik, L.S. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 400-410). New York: Macmillan.

Downey, M.T., & Levstik, L.S. (1988). Teaching and learning history: The research base. *Social Education, 52*, 336-342.

Engle, S.H. (1990). The Commission report and citizenship education. *Social Education, 54*, 431-434.

Engle, S, & Ochoa, A, (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Evans, R. (1989). Teacher conceptions of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 17*, 210-240.

Evans, R. (1992). Misunderstanding social studies: A rejoinder to Whelan. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*, 313-317.

Ferguson, P. (1991). Impacts on social and political participation. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 385-399). New York: Macmillan.

Furnham, A., & Stacey, B. (1991). *Young people's understanding of society*. New York: Routledge.

Furth, H. (1980). *The world of grown-ups*. New York: Elsevier.

Greene, J.P. (1968). *The reinterpretation of the American Revolution*. New York: Harper &

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Row.

Guzzetta, C. (1969). Children's knowledge of historically important Americans. In W. Herman (Ed.), *Current research in elementary school social studies* (pp. 392-400). New York: Macmillan.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1975). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly, 12*, 51-70.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Helmus, T., Toppin, E., Pounds, N., & Arnsdorf, V. (1988). *The United States yesterday and today*. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett & Ginn.

Howard, J, & Mendenhall, T. (1982). *Making history come alive: The place of history in schools*. Washington, D.C.: Report of the History Commission of the Council for Basic Education.

Hunt, M., & Metcalf, L. (1968). *Teaching high school social studies* (2nd Ed.). New York: Harper.

Kobrin, D. (1992). It's my country, too: A proposal for a student historian's history of the United States. *Teachers College Record, 94*, 329-342.

Levstik, L., & Pappas, C. (1992). New directions for studying historical understanding. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*, 369-385.

Levstik, L., & Pappas, C. (1987). Exploring the development of historical understanding. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 21*, 1-15.

Marker, G., & Mehlinger, H. (1992). Social studies. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 830-851). New York: Macmillan.

Martorella, P. (1985). *Elementary social studies: Developing reflective, competent, and concerned citizens*. Boston: Little, Brown.

McKeown, M.G., & Beck, I.L. (1990). The assessment and characterization of young learners' knowledge of a topic in history. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*, 688-726.

McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge.* New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Moore, S., Lare, J., & Wagner, K. (1985). *The child's political world: A longitudinal perspective.* New York: Praeger.

Morgan, E.S. (1956). *The birth of the Republic.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. (1989). *Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century.* Washington, DC: Author.

Newmann, F. (1990). Higher order thinking in teaching social studies: A rationale for assessment of classroom thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22,* 41-56.

Ogle, D. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher, 39,* 564-570.

Parker, W. (1987). Teachers' mediation in social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 15,* 1-22.

Parker, W., & Jarolimek, J. (1984). *Citizenship and the critical role of the social studies.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Ramsey, P., Holbrook, H., Johnson, H., & O'Toole, C. (1992, April). *The effects of a multicultural curriculum on children's perceptions of Native Americans.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Ravitch, D., & Finn, C. (1987). *What do our 17-year-olds know? A report of the first national assessment of history and literature.* New York: Harper & Row.

Ravitch, D. (1987). Tot sociology, or what happened to history in the grade schools? *American Scholar, 56,* 343-353.

Reed, E. (1989). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education. In P. Gagnon (Ed.), *The Bradley Commission on History in Schools* (pp.68-81). New York: Macmillan.

Resnick, L., & Klopfer, L. (Eds.) (1989). *Toward the thinking curriculum: Current cognitive research.* Washinton, DC: ASCD.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Seixas, P. (1993). The community of inquiry as a basis for knowledge and learning: The case of of history. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*, 305-324.

Shaver, J.S. (1991). *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan.

Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and classroom. In A. Dickinson, P. Lee, & P. Rogers (eds.), *Learning history* (pp. 39-84). London: Heinemann.

Thornton, S., & McCourt-Lewis, A.(1990, November). *A question in search of an answer: What do elementary children learn from studying the American Revolution?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly Symposium, Anaheim, California.

VanSledright, B., & Brophy, J. (1992). Storytelling, imagination, and fanciful elaboration in children's historical reconstructions. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*, 837-859.

[author] (1992a). *Stories of the American Revolution period: Comparisons of two fifth-grade teachers' curriculum mediation practices*. (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 67). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

[author] (1992b). *Teaching about the American Revolution: The case of Ramona Palmer*. (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 68). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

[author] (1992c). *Teaching about the American Revolution: The case of Sara Atkinson*. (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 69). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Whelan, M. (1992). History and the social studies: A response to the critics. *Theory and*

Research in Social Education, 20, 2-16.

Wilson, S.M. (1991). Parades of facts, stories of the past: What do novice history teachers need to know? In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners* (pp. 99-116). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wineburg, S.S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*, 495-519.

Wineburg, S.S., & Wilson, S.M. (1988). Models of wisdom in the teaching of history. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*, 50-58.

Wineburg, S.S., & Wilson, S.M. (1991). Subject matter knowledge in the teaching of history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching, Vol. 3* (pp. 305-347). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Pre-Unit Student Interview Protocol
The American Revolution

1. The original 13 colonies in North America were settled mostly by English people and were ruled by England. But later they became an independent country--the United States. How did that happen?

2. For a long time, the colonists were happy to think of themselves as English and to be ruled by the English king. However, later they changed their minds. Why?

3. What were some of the problems caused by the French and Indian War?

4. The colonists' slogan was "No taxation without representation." What does that mean? (Probe extensively).

5. What was the Boston Tea Party? (If the student knows, ask: "Why did they dump the tea into the ocean instead of just taking it home with them?"). Do you think it was a good idea to do this?

6. What was the Declaration of Independence?

7. What was in the Declaration of Independence--what did it say?

8. The colonists wanted to break away from England because they thought that the king was treating them unfairly. What do you think the English King George thought about the colonists?

9. Did all of the colonists want to break away from England, or just some of them, or what? (If student says just some of them, ask: "Well, if people disagreed about what to do, then what happened?")

10. Eventually, the Revolutionary War started and fighting broke out between English soldiers and American patriots. Do you know what happened and why?

11. Who were some of the leaders of the American Revolution? (Probe for specifics on at least two)

12. Who were some of the women who participated in the Revolution? (Again, probe for specifics on at least two)

13. What happened after the war was over?

14. After the Revolutionary War, the 13 colonies had become the United States. The land and the people were still the same, so what had changed? How were the 13 United States different from the 13 colonies? (Probe for specifics).

Conditional follow ups (if student does not answer #14 fully):

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14a. Who was the person (or persons) in charge of the colonies before the revolution? (If student says the governor, ask who was in charge of the governor).

14b. After the revolution the colonies became the United States. Who was the person(s) in charge of them then? How did this person(s) get to be in charge?

15. How did the people form a government for their new country called the United States? What did they do?

16. Have you ever heard of the Articles of Confederation? If so, tell me what you know about them. (Probe extensively)

17. What is the Constitution of the United States? Tell what you know about it. (Probe extensively: Who wrote it, Why was it written, What is in it, etc.)

18. If there was an argument at recess between some of the kids in this class and some other fifth-graders about who was going to use the tennis courts, how do you think it should be handled? (Probe, ask for the "why" and where they learned about it)

19. What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in American history than other kids in class? (Probe)

20. What happens if your idea about American history is different than Ms. Teacher's? What happens then? (Probe)

21. If you got involved in making this neighborhood or community a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe)

22. If you got involved in making this country a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe)

23. When you do assignments for class and to hand in to your teacher, which do you prefer--to work alone, with a partner, or in groups? (Probe)

24. How do you think important decisions should be made here in this class? (Probe) How about at home? (Probe)

25. What do you think about this interview? Why do you think I'm asking you all these questions?

Appendix B

Post-Unit Student Interview Protocol
The American Revolution

1. What do you think history is? (Probe extensively)

2. Why do you think they teach you history in school? (Probe extensively)

3. How might learning history help you in your life away from school? (Probe)

4. The original 13 colonies in North America were settled mostly by English people and were ruled by England. But later they became an independent country--the United States. How did that happen?

5. For a long time, the colonists were happy to think of themselves as English and to be ruled by the English king. However, later they changed their minds. Why?

6. What were some of the problems caused by the French and Indian War?

7. The colonists' slogan was "No taxation without representation." What does that mean? (Probe extensively).

8. What was the Boston Tea Party? (If the student knows, ask: "Why did they dump the tea into the ocean instead of just taking it home with them?"). Do you think it was a good idea to do this?

9. What was the Declaration of Independence?

10. What was in the Declaration of Independence--what did it say?

11. The colonists wanted to break away from England because they thought that the king was treating them unfairly. What do you think the English King George thought about the colonists?

12. Did all of the colonists want to break away from England, or just some of them, or what? (If student says just some of them, ask: "Well, if people disagreed about what to do, then what happened?")

13. Eventually, the Revolutionary War started and fighting broke out between English soldiers and American patriots. Do you know what happened and why?

14. Who were some of the leaders of the American Revolution? (Probe for specifics on at least two)

15. Who were some of the women who participated in the Revolution? (Again, probe for specifics on at least two)

16. What happened after the war was over?

17. After the Revolutionary War, the 13 colonies had become the United States. The land and the people were still the same, so what had changed? How were the 13 United States different from the 13 colonies? (Probe) Conditional follow ups (IF student does not answer #17 fully):

    17a. Who was the person (or persons) in charge of the colonies before the revolution? (If student says the governor, ask who was in charge of the governor).

    17b. After the revolution the colonies became the United States. Who was the person(s) in charge of them then? How did this person(s) get to be in charge?

18. How did the people form a government for their new country called the United States? What did they do?

19. Have you ever heard of the Articles of Confederation? If so, tell me what you know about them. (Probe extensively)

20. What is the Constitution of the United States? Tell what you know about it. (Probe extensively: Who wrote it, Why was it written, What is in it, etc.)

21. If there was an argument at lunch recess between some of the kids in this class and some other fifth-graders about who was going to use the soccer field, how do you think it should be handled? (Probe, ask for the "why" and where they learned about it)

22. What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in American history than other kids in class? (Probe)

23. What happens if your idea about American history is different than Ms. Teacher's? What happens then? (Probe)

24. If you got involved in making this neighborhood or community a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe)

25. If you got involved in making this country a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe, then ask: Which would you rather get involved in improving, the country or the community or both? Why?)

26. When you do assignments for class and to hand in to your teacher, which do you prefer--to work alone, with a partner, or in groups? (Probe)

27. How do you think important decisions should be made here in this class? (Probe) How about at home? (Probe)

28. Did you think learning about the American Revolution and the Constitution was interesting, or not, or what? Tell me what you thought about studying this history. (Probe)

29. What do you think about this interview? Why do you think I'm asking you all these questions?

TABLE 1. K-W-L DATA BY CLASS

QUESTION 1: What do I know about the American Revolution?

	Atkinson's Class			Palmer's Class		
	Males (n=13)	Females (n=9)	TOTAL (N=22)	Males (n=10)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=20)
Nothing; not very much	2	4	6	-	1	1
A. Names, Events, and Terms						
1. Names						
George Washington (general)	4	1	5	3	2	5
Paul Revere	-	-	0	5	6	11
Thomas Jefferson	2	-	2	-	-	0
John Adams	1	-	1	1	-	1
Molly Pitcher	-	-	0	1	-	1
Deborah Sampson	-	1	1	-	-	0
Abigail Adams (had a role)	-	1	1	-	-	0
2. Events						
Boston Tea Party	2	-	2	4	-	4
Paul Revere's Ride	-	-	0	1	1	2
Battle of Lexington	-	-	0	1	1	2
Minutemen (ready in a minute)	-	-	0	1	1	2
Battle of Bunker Hill	-	-	0	-	2	2
3. Terms						
Declaration of Independence	2	-	2	-	1	1
Indians	-	-	0	1	1	2
Mayflower	-	-	0	1	-	1
Jamestown	-	-	0	1	-	1
B. Cause-Effect Relationships						
England fought for freedom	2	-	2	-	-	0
A war for freedom; independence	1	-	1	1	-	1
A war started by America	1	1	2	1	1	2
Had to do with taxes (on tea)	-	1	1	1	1	2
England fought to control us	-	-	0	1	-	1
Americans won the war	-	-	0	3	2	5
Fought over slavery; North won	-	-	0	1	-	1
Trade was a reason for the war	-	-	0	-	1	1
C. General Ideas						
It was a revolution; a war	5	2	7	-	2	2
Around 1700s; a long time ago	4	-	4	2	-	2
Many people died	-	-	0	2	4	6
Lasted for five years	-	-	0	-	2	2
Rebels were mistreated by British	-	-	0	1	-	1
Fought between French and Americans	-	-	0	1	-	1
Brits hired the Hessians	-	-	0	-	1	1
Women helped the soldiers	-	1	1	-	-	0
Tories supported England	-	-	0	1	1	2
Rebels supported the revolution	-	-	0	1	1	2
Cannons, muskets, pistols	-	-	0	2	-	2
The redcoats were coming	-	-	0	1	1	2
"Give me liberty or give me death"	-	-	0	1	-	1
Famous war with famous people	-	-	0	2	-	2
No modern weapons	-	-	0	1	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2. K-W-L DATA BY CLASS

QUESTION 2: What do I want to know about the American Revolution?

	Atkinson's Class			Palmer's Class		
	Males (n=13)	Females (n=9)	TOTAL (N=22)	Males (n=10)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=20)
Everything; anything	7	5	12	2	1	3
I don't know	-	1	1	-	-	0
How and why they fought?	1	-	1	3	9	12
What women were involved?	-	4	4	1	-	1
Who fought against America?	1	-	1	-	6	6
How many survived? (or died?)	-	1	1	5	4	9
When it happened? (or started?)	-	-	0	5	9	14
How long did it last?	-	-	0	3	4	7
Where did it take place?	-	-	0	3	6	9
Who was in it?	-	-	0	2	3	5
More about quotations?	-	-	0	1	5	6
What were the events?	-	-	0	1	2	3
How did it get started?	1	1	2	2	1	3
More about battles?	1	-	1	2	1	3
More about war leaders?	1	-	1	2	2	4
Famous people?	-	1	1	1	3	4
What sort of weapons?	-	-	0	1	2	3
How did it end?	-	-	0	-	3	3
Who made the flag?	-	-	0	2	-	2
How long ago did it happen?	-	-	0	1	1	2
More about the Boston Tea Party?	1	-	1	-	-	0
More about George Washington?	1	-	1	-	-	0
More about places in the war?	-	1	1	-	1	1
Did women sneak into the war?	-	1	1	-	-	0
More about Deborah Sampson?	-	1	1	-	-	0
Did they sign a treaty?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Who was president?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Were Native Americans in it?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Whose fault was it?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Could they have stopped the war?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Did people want to fight in the war?	-	-	0	-	1	1
What happened because of the war?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Who attacked first?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Why did they fight over a tea party?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Is the woman who made the flag in this story?	-	-	0	-	1	1
What affect does it have on us today?	-	-	0	-	1	1

TABLE 3. K-W-L DATA BY CLASS

QUESTION 3: What have I learned about the American Revolution?

	Atkinson's Class			Palmer's Class		
	Males (n=12)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=22)	Males (n=12)	Females ((n=13)	TOTAL (N=25)
A. Recall of Names, Events, Terms						
1. Names						
George Washington (general, leader)	-	1	1	4	7	11
Thomas Jefferson	-	-	0	1	9	10
Paul Revere (famous ride; had helpers)	-	-	0	6	6	12
Ben Franklin	-	-	0	5	7	12
Molly Pitcher (helped colonial soldiers)	-	-	0	8	10	18
Sam Adams	1	-	1	5	3	8
John Hancock	-	-	0	1	5	6
Nathan Hale (famous quote)	-	-	0	3	1	4
King George	-	-	0	1	3	4
James Madison	-	-	0	2	1	3
John Adams	-	-	0	2	-	2
Patrick Henry	-	-	0	2	-	2
Benedict Arnold	-	-	0	2	-	2
General Howe	-	-	0	1	1	2
John Paul Jones	-	1	1	1	-	1
Alexander Hamilton	-	1	1	-	-	0
Lydia Darragh	-	-	0	-	1	1
General Cornwallis	-	-	0	-	1	1
Deborah Sampson	-	-	0	-	1	1
Thomas Paine	-	-	0	-	1	1
Thomas Edison (getting peace in Britain)	-	-	0	1	-	1
2. Events (with descriptions)						
Boston Tea Party	5	3	8	10	8	18
Boston Massacre	1	-	1	9	2	11
Battle at Lexington (first shots)	1	1	2	1	2	3
Battle at Concord (second battle)	-	-	0	1	2	3
Battle at Saratoga (turning point)	1	-	1	1	1	2
Boycotting (following tea tax)	1	-	1	-	-	0
Ratification of the Constitution (struggle over)	3	5	8	-	-	0
Passage of the Bill of Rights	1	1	2	1	4	5
Signing of the Declaration of Independence	-	1	1	5	6	11
French and Indian War	-	-	0	4	1	5
Paul Revere's ride	-	-	0	4	5	9
Suprise attack on British/Hessians at Trenton	-	-	0	3	2	5
Treaty of Paris signed	-	-	0	2	-	2
King George's passing of unfair taxes	-	-	0	-	3	3
French joined Americans	-	-	0	-	1	1
Winter at Valley Forge	-	-	0	-	1	1
States sent representatives to the Continental Congress	-	-	0	-	1	1
3. Terms (listed)						
Three Branches of Government	5	5	10	-	-	0
Continental Congress	-	-	0	6	4	10
Hessians	-	-	0	7	2	9
Intolerable Acts	2	-	2	4	4	8
Declaration of Independence	1	1	2	4	3	7
Minutemen	-	-	0	4	3	7
Bill of Rights (Amendments)	-	-	0	2	4	6
The Constitution	2	3	5	-	-	0
Articles of Confederation	-	-	0	4	1	5
Patriots and Loyalists	-	-	0	1	4	5
Militia	-	-	0	1	2	3
Sons of Liberty	1	-	1	1	1	2
Daughters of Liberty	-	-	0	1	1	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3. (continued)

3. Terms (continued)	Atkinson's Class Males (n=12)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=22)	Palmer's Class Males (n=12)	Females (n=13)	TOTAL (N=25)
Tax Acts (e.g., Stamp Act)	2	1	3	1	-	1
"No taxation without representation"	-	-	0	1	1	2
Traitor	-	1	1	1	-	1
Privateers	-	-	0	2	-	2
The American Revolution	-	-	0	1	1	2
"Give me liberty or give me death"	-	-	0	-	1	1
"Shot heard 'round the world"	-	-	0	1	-	1
B. Cause-Effect Relationships						
Colonists fought for freedom from Britain	1	2	3	-	4	4
War fought over "unfair" taxation	1	-	1	-	2	2
Constitution needed ratication for passage	4	2	6	-	-	0
Bill of Rights protects people's freedom	1	-	1	-	-	0
Women helped to win the war	2	2	4	-	3	3
Many died because of the war	-	-	0	1	-	1
America became the U.S. because they won the war	-	-	0	-	1	1
C. General Ideas and Statements						
Women had an important role in the war	3	6	9	1	5	6
Learned a lot about famous people; heroes	1	1	2	1	-	1
Learned a lot about laws	1	1	2	-	-	0
Who fought, where, and why	2	-	2	-	3	3
Main strategies of the war	1	-	1	-	-	0
Who won the war	1	-	1	-	-	0
How long the first president served	-	1	1	-	-	0
About foreign help in the war	-	1	1	-	-	0
How people felt about the Constitution	-	1	1	-	-	0
Men in the war	-	2	2	-	-	0
Lifestyle of the colonists	-	1	1	-	-	0
Most men and women were wealthy	-	1	1	-	-	0
Favorite part was the leaders and female spies	-	-	0	1	-	1
Blacks had a role in the war	-	1	1	1	1	2
Britain had the best navy	-	-	0	3	-	3
Many died in many places	-	-	0	1	1	2
Learned famous dates and quotations	-	-	0	1	-	1
The British almost won	-	-	0	1	-	1
King George was very selfish and mean	-	-	0	-	1	1
Everybody was bald	-	-	0	1	-	1
America had no navy	-	-	0	1	-	1
Colonists loved tea	-	-	0	1	-	1
Lasted for a long time	-	-	0	-	1	1
I'd like to be brave like Molly Pitcher someday	-	-	0	-	1	1
It was very interesting	1	-	1	-	-	0
It was fun to learn about	-	1	1	2	1	3
I liked writing the letters to England	-	-	0	1	-	1
People are really racist	-	-	0	-	1	1
Chapters in the textbook were confusing	1	-	1	-	-	0
Textbook should be more comprehensive	-	-	0	1	-	1
Our teacher did a good job teaching us	-	-	0	-	1	1
I learned everything I wanted to know	3	2	5	-	1	1

Table 4. Modal Responses to the Knowledge Section of the Interview Protocol

Protocol Question	Pre/ Post	Modal Responses	A's Students (n=6)	P's Students (n=6)	TOTAL (N=12)
Eventually the colonists became an independent nation. How?	Pre	Not sure; don't know	4	5	9
	Post	Fought a war over taxes and became free from British control	6	6	12
Why did the colonists change their minds about being ruled by the king?	Pre	Not sure; don't know	4	6	10
	Post	Too many taxes	5	5	10
What were some of the problems caused by the French and Indian War?	Pre	Not sure; don't know	5	6	11
	Post	Many people died (a)	2	2	4
		Not sure; don't know (b)	(1)	2	3
What does "no taxation without representation "mean?	Pre	Not sure; don't know (a)	4	5	9
		People shouldn't pay taxes unless they had a say in them (b)			
	Post	Colonists wouldn't pay taxes unless they had a say in Parliament	4	(0)	4
			6	6	12
What was the Boston Tea Party?	Pre	Not sure; don't know	3	5	8
	Post	Colonists dressed up as Indians and dumped tea in Boston harbor as a protest against taxes	6	6	12
What was the Declaration of Independence?	Pre	Let's people have rights, equality (a)	3	2	5
		Document that made U.S. separate from England (b)	3	(1)	4
	Post	Document that declared the colonists independent from England	4	5	9
What was in the Declaration of Independence?	Pre	Not sure; don't know	5	5	10
	Post	Not sure or I don't remember	2	3	5
What do you think King George thought about the colonists?	Pre	He became angry when the colonists rebelled	3	4	7
	Post	He was angry and had a right to be (a)	4	4	8
		He thought the colonists were being unfair (b)	4	(3)	7
Did all the colonists want to break away from England or what?	Pre	Not sure (a)	3	5	8
		Only some did (b)	3	(3)	6
	Post	Some of them did	4	5	9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Eventually fighting broke out. What happened and why?	Pre	Not sure; don't know(a)	2	3	5
		Patriots won (b)	2	(2)	4
		Colonists wanted to break free (c)			
		Battle at Lexington started the war (a)	2	(0)	2
	Post	We don't know who shot first (b)	4	(3)	7
			(0)	4	4
Who were some of the leaders of the American Revolution?	Pre	Don't know; not sure (a)	4	(1)	5
		George Washington (b)	(1)	4	5
	Post	George Washington	4	6	10
Who were some of the women of the Revolution?	Pre	Not sure; don't know (a)	4	3	7
		Molly Pitcher (b)	(0)	3	3
	Post	Molly Pitcher (a)	(1)	5	6
		Not sure; don't know (b)	2	(2)	4
What happened after the war was over?	Pre	Colonies became the United States (a)	4	(0)	4
		Not sure; don't know (b)	(2)	2	4
		Americans fought/won (c)	(1)	2	3
	Post	Colonists won and became the United States	4	6	10
How were the United States different from the 13 colonies?	Pre	Not sure; don't know (a)	2	4	6
		They had presidents (b)	2	4	6
	Post	Got a president to lead the United States (a)	(3)	6	9
		Created laws to join the colonies; wrote the Constitution (b)	6	(1)	7
How did people form a new government for the U.S.?	Pre	Not sure; don't know (a)	5	(2)	7
		They had leaders make decisions (b)			
		People met to form a government (a)	(1)	5	6
	Post	They wrote a Constitution that needed to be ratified by the states (b)	(4)	5	9
			5	(0)	5
What do you know about the Articles of Confederation?	Pre	Not sure or nothing	6	6	12
	Post	Not sure or don't remember	5	4	9
What is the Constitution?	Pre	Not sure; don't know (a)	(1)	6	7
		It's about freedom and rights, laws (b)	3	(1)	4
	Post	It guarantees people's rights (a)	3	4	7
		Not sure; don't know (b)	(0)	4	4

(a) First of three modal responses
(b) Second of three modal responses
(c) Third of three modal responses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5. SILVER BURDETT AND GINN TEST RESULTS BY CLASS

35 Multiple Choice Items	Atkinson's Class (N=23)	Palmer's Class (N=25)
Mean Raw Score (Percentage Correct)	27.4 (78%)	27.6 (79%)
High Score (Percentage Correct)	34 (97%) (n=2)	34 (97%) (n=3)
Low Score (Percentage Correct)	17 (49%) (n=1)	13 (37%) (n=1)
Median Score (Percentage Correct)	28.5 (81%)	28.5 (81%)
t=.11 df=46 p>.10		
Test Scores (including essays)*		
Mean Raw Score	32 (78%)	-- --
High Score (41 points possible plus extra credit points)	42 (102%)	-- --
Low Score	19 (45%)	-- --

* Palmer did not use a number scale to grade the essays. As such, a numerical comparison of the overall test scores is not possible here.

Table 6. Modal Responses to the Disposition Section of the Interview Protocol

Protocol Question	Pre/ Post	Modal Responses	A's Students (n=6)	P's Students (n=6)	TOTAL (N=12)
How do you think an argument over use of the tennis court (pre)/soccer field (post) should be handled?	Pre	Talk out a solution (a)	6	(5)	11
		Switch it off by recess or week (b)			
		Groups would switch off every other	(4)	6	10
	Post	recess (a)			
		Share the space (b)	5	(4)	9
			(0)	5	5
What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in U.S history than other students in class?	Pre	That's OK (a)	6	5	11
		People have a right to their opinion			
		(b)	6	(0)	6
	Post	That's OK	6	6	12
What happens if your ideas about U.S. history are different than your teacher's?	Pre	That's OK	6	5	11
		[Modal qualifications:			
		Need to back up your opinion with evidence from books (a);			
		Everyone has a right to their opinion (b)]	(3)	(0)	
		That's OK	(3)	(2)	
	Post		6	6	12
What would you do to improve your community or neighborhood?	Pre	It's good as it is	3	1	4
	Post	Clean up pollution	4	4	8
What would you do to make this country a better place to live?	Pre	Make laws controlling pollution			
		Clean things up (crime, pollution)	2	4	6
	Post				
			3	5	8
Which would you prefer to improve the country or your community?	Post	Improve the country--bigger			
	only	benefits (a)	3	4	7
		Improve my community--it's easier			
		(b)	3	4	7
When doing assignments, do you prefer to work in groups, pairs, or alone?	Pre	Pairs, it's easier to concentrate (a)			
		Groups, get better ideas, learn	4	6	10
		more, it's fun (b)			
		Pairs, it's easier, you get more	4	(1)	5
	Post	ideas, a group is too hard when			
		people disagree, too confusing then	5	3	8
How do you think important decisions should be made in class?	Pre	Vote on them (a)	6	3	9
		Some decisions should be made by			
		those in charge (b)	(3)	3	6
	Post	Vote on them, by democracy (a)			
		Teacher could choose what to teach	5	(3)	8
		us (b)			
			(1)	6	7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Did you find this period in history interesting? Tell me what you thought.	Post only	Interesting (Modal qualifier: Enjoyed studying the struggle over the Constitution)	6	4	10
			4	0	
What do you think history is?	Post only	What happened in the past (Modal qualifier: Most important things in the past)	6	6	12
			4	2	
Why do you think they teach you history in school?	Post only	So you know what happened in the past and why	5	4	9
How might learning history help you in your life away from school?	Post only	I'm not sure (a)	2	4	6
		It helps you know what things you are interested in (b)	2	(0)	2

(a) First of two modal responses
(b) Second of two modal responses